EVALUATION of Smart Growth on the Ground

Prepared by:
Social Planning and Research Council of BC

January 31, 2007
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKGROUND</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Objectives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Impacts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Strengths</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Challenges</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A: CASE STUDY – MAPLE RIDGE</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting Involved</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the Principles</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Forum, Educational Workshops and Charrette</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Skills in the Community</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Impacts</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a model for public consultation in sustainable development planning</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG Partnership</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Outcomes</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of the Partner Organizations</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGOG’s Committees and Partner Communities</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGOG 10-Step Process</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Staff Resources</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Summaries of SGOG’s Three Case Studies</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX G: MATRIX</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX H:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF PARTICIPANTS BY COMMUNITY</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX I: LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report evaluates the outcomes to date, in addition to the effectiveness, efficiency, impacts, and sustainability of the Smart Growth on the Ground (SGOG) initiative. The report highlights key strengths, challenges, and lessons learned in the three pilot communities where the initiative has been implemented, which are then used to inform a set of guiding principles for the future of the project, including recommendations on strategies for improving the SGOG approach and its partnerships.

Several research tools were employed in this evaluation process. A literature review was used to create a backgrounder on the SGOG initiative, as well as provide some context for the evaluators. Self-assessment questionnaires, focus groups, and key informant interviews allowed charrette participants, funders, project partners, advisory committee members, and project management team members the opportunity to provide input to the evaluation process regarding their perceptions around the process, outcomes, and long-term impacts of SGOG.

All stakeholders consulted during the evaluation process were able to point to a number of strengths of the SGOG initiative. Namely, stakeholders were extremely impressed with the quality of the research produced by the SGOG team. Stakeholders also felt that the process was well-facilitated to ensure that the time of all those involved was well used, while also giving everyone the opportunity to share their opinions. As well, the inclusion of the public in planning processes was seen as an innovative and exciting new way of addressing planning.

Stakeholders did also express some concerns about SGOG, especially around the perceived outcomes. Stakeholders were concerned that there have been few outcomes to date that can be traceable to the SGOG process in the pilot communities. Although district staff in the three communities and project partners are aware of some applications and proposed projects that incorporate smart growth principles, members of the public felt that this progress has not been communicated to them.

Stakeholders pointed to a number of potential positive long-term impacts that will likely result from the SGOG process, such as creating public
awareness and advocacy around smart growth and sustainable planning. As such, despite some of the challenges identified by the stakeholders, they want to see the SGOG project continue with its plan to unroll the initiative in seven more communities across the province, albeit with some enhancements. Stakeholders provided several constructive criticisms to help improve the SGOG process and facilitate more measurable outcomes and long-term impacts. Some key suggestions include customizing the process to better reflect local nuances, designing signature projects with quick implementation times to help maintain momentum, and communicating achievements to the public to increase accountability.
INTRODUCTION

Smart Growth on the Ground (SGOG) aims to be a pragmatic response to the barriers that prevent the widespread adoption and use of sustainable development practices in community- and neighborhood-based land-use planning in this province. After three years in operation, the program has stewarded the leaders and citizens of three very different communities – Maple Ridge, Squamish and Greater Oliver – through a ten-step process of plan preparation notable for its use of the charrette. With a goal of ten smart-growth plans in BC communities in ten years, SGOG wished to undergo a formal evaluation of its partnership and the overall initiative.

This report evaluates the outcomes to date, in addition to the effectiveness, efficiency, impacts, and sustainability of SGOG. The report highlights key strengths, challenges, and lessons learned in the three pilot communities where the initiative has been implemented, which are then used to inform a set of guiding principles for the future of the project. Finally a set of recommendations on strategies for improving the SGOG approach and its partnerships are presented based on the findings of the evaluation process.

Methodology

The methodology employed for this evaluation process included various qualitative research tools in order to evaluate the outcomes to date, in addition to the effectiveness, efficiency, impacts, and sustainability of SGOG. Research tools included a literature scan, self-assessment questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups.

The first step was to perform a literature scan to become familiar with the project. Documents, including the existing Concept Plans, newspaper articles about SGOG, meeting minutes, and the business plan were provided to the consultant by SGOG staff. These documents were summarized into a background paper to help understand the context of the SGOG project.

In order to begin collecting perspectives on the SGOG process, two separate self-assessment questionnaires were administered as part of the evaluation process. One set of questionnaires was administered to the project management committees in Squamish and Maple Ridge (Oliver did not have a project management committee). The second set of
questionnaires was administered to the SGOG staff, partners, advisory committee, and funders. The purpose of the questionnaires was to inquire what stakeholders thought of the SGOG process, outcomes, and long-term impacts. Using Survey Monkey, an online surveying tool, to deliver the survey, we got a 30% response rate among project management committee members and a 43% response rate among SGOG staff, partners, advisory members, and funders. Four advisory members indicated that they had either joined the committee since its last meeting or had not been involved for quite a while and, therefore, declined to fill in the survey.

Focus groups were conducted in all three of the pilot communities to learn about the SGOG process from the perspective of the local charrette participants. One focus group was held in Oliver, two in Squamish, and one in Maple Ridge. The focus group discussions focused on the participants’ impressions of the opening forum and workshops, as well as the charrette process and the perceived outcomes and potential long-term impacts of the SGOG process in each community. A number of participants were interested in participating in the evaluation process, but unable to attend the focus group sessions. One-on-one interviews were held with all of those participants who were unable to attend the focus groups, but interested in contributing to the evaluation process.¹

The final step was to conduct a set of seven key informant interviews with central SGOG staff and partners.² Although the key informants all received the self-assessment questionnaires, the interviews allowed for a more in-depth discussion, especially highlighting issues such as the partnership and relationships with the three pilot communities.

¹ Please see Appendix G for a list of evaluation process participants in each community.
² Please see Appendix H for a list of key informants.
BACKGROUND

Overview

SGOG is an innovative land-use planning project that tries to bring sustainable design, planning and development practices to communities throughout the province. Its focus is on implementing smart growth and sustainability principles - on getting ‘smart growth on the ground’. SGOG began in 2003, in a context of rapid urban development in BC, when no or very little regard was being given to ‘green’ development alternatives to sprawl. The initial project period was set at three years, during which time three case studies were to be undertaken, while a 10-year time horizon (with a total of 10 case studies) was planned throughout BC for the project as a whole.

As a collaborative partnership between the Design Centre for Sustainability at UBC (DCS), Smart Growth BC (SGBC) and the Real Estate Institute of BC (REIBC), SGOG’s staff members – experts in the field of sustainable planning and development - go to communities that have agreed to partner with SGOG, and, over the course of several months, take their leaders, staff and local stakeholder representatives through a 10-step sustainable development planning process. The focus of this process is an intensive design charrette. This is an intensive design-oriented workshop lasting three or four days where brain-storming experts and community representatives come up with conceptual plans that would normally take months to create.

Vision

SGOG’s vision is “to transform sustainable community design and construction in British Columbia from being the exception to representing the norm.”

Mission

SGOG’s mission is “to help citizens and their elected leaders implement ten smarter, more sustainable, new or retrofitted neighbourhoods over the next ten years. Each will house an average of ten thousand

---

3 See Appendix F for a more complete SGOG overview.
4 The statements regarding the vision, mission, approach, principles and key objectives are drawn directly from SGOG’s Business Plan of 2003[0].
residents, and collectively will represent over ten billion dollars of investment redirected into more sustainable forms of development.”

**Approach**

SGOG’s approach is “to shift the land development process in BC in favour of smart growth and sustainability by putting our trust in people. [SGOG] will use inclusive design processes, extensive public consultation and capacity building, and outreach to and input from the development community. A key focus will be on the use of design charrettes as a public engagement, stakeholder buy-in, and decision-support tool.”

**Principles**

SGOG tries to incorporate eight principles into its community planning efforts. It asks that the elected officials of each partnering community agree to them before embarking on the SGOG process. The principles are:

- Each community is complete.
- Options to cars are emphasized.
- Work in harmony with natural systems.
- Buildings and infrastructure are smarter, greener and cheaper.
- Housing serves the needs of the whole community.
- Good jobs are close to home.
- The spirit of each community is protected.
- Everyone has a voice.

**Key Objectives**

SGOG had six objectives from the outset:

- To **influence the culture of development** such that sustainable communities become the norm rather than the exception.
- To **effect the implementation** of developments that incorporate comprehensive smart growth and sustainability principles.
- To **create wider public and industry awareness** and acceptance of sustainable community planning, design and construction.
- To **increase the participation and expertise** of citizens and community organizations in local development processes.
- To **provide tangible evidence and case studies** of the costs and benefits of smarter, more sustainable communities.
To **develop national and international recognition** for the efforts of SGOG, its partners, and BC.
ANALYSIS

The analysis for this evaluation synthesizes the finding from all the various research tools employed in this evaluation process. The findings are organized around the stakeholders' views on the SGOG process, implementation, and long-term impacts. The findings are then highlighted through examining some of SGOG's key strengths, challenges and lessons learned.

Process

The vast majority of project partners, funders and advisory committee members said they would recommend the SGOG process to other communities in its current form. Most felt strongly that the process has had an extremely positive impact in the pilot communities. The charrette participants and project management team members consulted during the evaluation process definitely felt that there is a great deal of value to the SGOG process and that there has been a somewhat positive impact, but also indicated that there is some room for improvement.

Facilitation and Charrette

Generally across all three communities, participants expressed a strong appreciation for the expertise provided to them through the SGOG team. All three communities found the facilitators to be excellent at moving the process forward and ensuring that participants had equal opportunity to express their opinions. Participants were particularly impressed with how quickly the experts were able to take what they heard during each day of the charrette and come back the next day with the necessary research to support the discussion and move it forward. Participants also found the design brief useful in that it provided context for the discussion, although participants in all three communities, especially the residents who are not generally involved in planning, suggested that the document could be more user-friendly.

An interesting debate emerged during the evaluation process, which had to do with whether the charrette should focus more on discussion or on design. Participants with more technical expertise felt that the mapping and design exercises are really important for moving the ideas forward and can be an excellent tool for guiding the discussion. However, many of those who have not been previously involved in planning and design
expressed that they would have liked to see more emphasis on discussion rather than mapping out the proposed designs.

There was also some debate around the use of small groups in the charrette. Some participants said that they felt more comfortable speaking their minds in the smaller groups, but others felt that they had cross-cutting interests. As well, it was mentioned that some of the ideas discussed in the small groups did not get covered in the detail necessary when they were brought back to the larger group.

**Representation and Inclusiveness**

The issue of representation among the charrette team members came up in all three communities. Participants would have liked to have seen more residents participating in charrette, but most project management team members, partners, funders and advisory members were pleased with the range of representatives. Another issue that emerged more during the individual interviews than in the focus groups was the lack of representation around social concerns in the communities on the charrette team, compared to development and environmental concerns. While the Oliver charrette team had both the mayor and some city councilors represented on the team, the participants in the communities of Squamish and Maple Ridge were quite concerned about the lack of representation from local politicians.

Inclusiveness was more of an issue in Oliver than in the other two communities. While participants in Maple Ridge and Squamish found the process to be inclusive, allowing people equal air time to express their opinions, Oliver participants were less positive. This is likely because of the existing divide between the rural and town communities in Oliver, which meant that there were existing issues that needed to be considered at the charrette.

Further to the issue of lack of representatives to speak to social issues in the communities, the topic of social aspects of smart growth, according to participants, were not adequately addressed. Participants in Squamish and Maple Ridge were particularly concerned about the lack of emphasis on the issue of employment. Participants in these two communities were also concerned that their discussions did not focus on the actual costs of the ideas that were being discussed for the Concept Plans.
Participants suggested that if some important stakeholder groups are visibly missing from the charrette, SGOG has to make an effort ‘to go to them’. They said this could involve holding a consultation meeting at the high school to engage youth, or on-reserve to include the Aboriginal community where reserves are located adjacent to the study community. One project partner suggested that the forums could be more attractive to a wider audience if they used a more engaging method than one-way PowerPoint presentations. The partner suggested instead to use a café-style event to emphasize interaction.

Applicability of the Process to Different Communities

Participants did express some concern around the appropriateness of the SGOG process for their particular communities. While SGOG partners, advisory members, and project management team members felt that the public had ownership over the process, the term ‘cookie-cutter approach’ came up among both the Oliver and Maple Ridge charrette participants. Participants in all three communities discussed how the process could have been more tailored to their local concerns and circumstances. While they all appreciated the outside expertise, discussions in all three communities drew attention to the fact that the process and facilitators often focused on some issues that were not necessarily appropriate for the realities of the specific communities. Participants in all three communities could point to examples of ideas that consumed a great deal of attention despite local residents, staff and politicians thinking that they would not work in their communities. One project management team member supported the charrette team participants in saying, “some of us felt that the process predetermined too much the outcome. New attempts at SGOG ought perhaps to be more free-flowing and allow for more creativity and innovative solutions. The principles of SGOG have an inevitability which causes consensus where consensus may in fact not exist.”

All three communities were smaller communities, and many participants felt that the SGOG process was designed for a larger urban setting, especially around issues of having opportunities for living, working, and entertainment in the same neighbourhoods and car usage. One respondent said that the principle around, “options to the car are emphasized has been difficult as our community is becoming a bedroom community to Vancouver”, thereby pointing out that applying all principles in all communities can be difficult. However, there was a disconnect between charrette participants and project management team
members, as project management team members felt that the principle around complete communities is important for their communities, but charrette participants felt that this was not relevant to small communities, as everything is already close together. One project partner suggested now that the three case studies are complete, some templates could be developed to capture the needs of different types of communities in BC.

Research

Participants would have liked to have seen more transparency around which issues are researched and developed into designs. Participants in all three communities claimed that they asked for research around a particular concept and were told by the SGOG team that it was not within their budget to conduct this research. Participants said they would like to know how these decisions were made, as this situation could give off the appearance of being biased towards certain ideas.

As well, in terms of research, participants would have liked to have seen some more examples and case studies from other communities. This issue came up in Oliver and Squamish. They would have liked to have gotten some ideas from similar communities about sustainable development initiatives that have been successful elsewhere, as well as determine some lessons learned around those initiatives.

While participants were all extremely impressed with the research that was carried out, many participants felt that the information coming back to them, especially through the design brief was overwhelming. This was particularly the case for those participants without a design background. Participants in all three communities said that the design brief could have been more user-friendly by highlighting the higher level points needed to carry the discussion forward.

Budget

While most project partners, funders, advisory members, and project management team members felt that the budget was sufficient for the project, project partners did admit in the key informant interviews that fundraising was not a strong suit for SGOG. However, stakeholders generally felt that the budget was well managed.
Partnership

SGOG stakeholders were very positive about the partnership between REIBC, SGBC, and DCS, stating that this partnership provides an excellent balance between the sectors relevant to a project such as this. While DCS provides the academic expertise, SGBC has the ability to facilitate an inclusive community planning process, and REIBC provides the grounding necessary to ensure that outcomes are realistic given the current real estate market and practices.

Although charrette participants claimed to be clear on the partner organizations’ distinct roles, the partners reported some degree of overlap in the responsibilities, leading to some ambiguities around the partnership. There was also some discussion that the workload was not being distributed equally, with DCS carrying out the bulk of the work, despite a lack of recognition due to the fact that the SGOG name resembles that of SGBC. One partner was particularly concerned about sustaining this level of research on an on-going basis as the SGOG project is unrolled across the province, given that the current amount of research was taking up more time and resources than DCS has available. As well, although the partners felt that the executive committee was working fairly well, they did mention that its relationship to the partners could be made clearer.

Advisory Committee

Those involved with the advisory committee felt that their expertise could have been better utilized. They said that the group did not meet frequently enough and that they were largely unaware of issues of importance, such as budgets. Advisory members also felt unclear about their function and did not feel that they had the opportunity to provide sufficient guidance to project managers in the pilot communities. Project partners explained that part of the reason as to why the advisory committee had not been consulted in over a year was that the need for the advisory committee declined in importance as the project came to the implementation stage. Partners said that were they to make better use of the advisory, the committee could be helpful in terms of public education and fundraising tasks.
SGOG Compared to Existing Planning Processes

Project partners, funders, advisory members, and project management team members felt that the SGOG process was better at a number of key areas than existing planning processes, in that SGOG is:

- Leading to change in the sustainability of development in my community
- Educating the public about smart growth and sustainability
- Engaging the members of the public in the development and planning processes
- Creating research on topics important to local sustainability
- Coming up with innovative land use and design solutions

Partners suggested that SGOG process was better in these areas because of the SGOG format, which employs several different components and exercises, the integrated way in which the process addresses planning, the collaboration involved, and the ability to think big while focusing on practical ideas. Respondents were not, however convinced that the SGOG process is better at following through to ensure that plans become a reality.

Implementation

Evidence of Implementation

In terms of implementation, participants in Oliver were still optimistic that the draft Concept Plan, when completed, would be implemented in their community, especially because the community has the support of the mayor and Council. Participants in Squamish and Maple Ridge, on the other hand, expressed that they were a bit discouraged. They felt that a lot of effort had been put in on the part of the community and that there have been no projects implemented to date that are clearly associated with the SGOG process. They, especially residents, indicated that they had not heard anything about the process until they were contacted for the evaluation process. All three communities discussed the importance of momentum to ensure that this process is actually implemented, but there was recognition in all the discussions that some of these projects are fairly large scale and that there will inevitably be a lag time in implementation.
The sentiments of the charrette participants around implementation were reflected in responses from the project management team members in Squamish and Maple Ridge. Although they feel that the process was implemented in a timely manner, project management team members acknowledged that there were some difficulties in making plans into a reality. Most team members disagreed that their communities now have some tangible evidence and case studies of the costs and benefits of smarter, more sustainable communities, indicating that they do not feel that there has been any concrete evidence of implementation of the Concept Plans or smart growth principles as a result of the SGOG process in their communities.

Perhaps as a result of the lack of representatives for social issues of concern in the three communities, charrette participants, partners, funders, advisory members, and project management teams felt that the more social smart growth principles were not implemented in the communities to the same degree as the other environmental and economically-oriented principles. Partners, funders, advisory members and project management team members agreed with charrette participants that the principle of ‘good jobs close to home’ was largely overlooked in the Concept Plans. The project management team members also reflected opinions of the charrette participants, in that they felt that the principle around housing, another social issue, was not implemented to the same extent as other principles. One respondent did point out, however, that the issue employment is harder to address with the process being so focused on land use issues.

**Communicating Outcomes**

Participants, especially in Squamish and Maple Ridge, felt that some follow-up with the communities is necessary to facilitate implementation. They mentioned that in order to carry the projects forward, the SGOG team needs to stay involved with the communities after the Concept Plan is completed to support the implementation process. Participants talked about the issue of accountability, in that they contributed a lot of time to the process and expect that the SGOG team will help see it through to completion. Project management team members, on the other hand, mostly felt that there has been a sufficient degree of dissemination around the results to-date of the SGOG process in their communities. While participants in the charrette, especially the residents that were participants, were less confident that smart growth principles are now being applied to development projects in the communities, project
management team members, funders, advisory committee members, and project partners indicated that they do see this happening. This discrepancy in opinions most likely exists because project management team members are more likely to be ‘in the know’ in terms of development applications and plans as a result of their positions in their community.

**Facilitating Implementation**

Participants in all three communities mentioned that it would have been useful to have some discussion of cost-analysis when assessing the feasibility of the ideas put forth in the charrette. Participants felt that it would have helped them prioritize which ideas they wanted to move forward with. Knowing what is realistic before it gets to the design phase would be helpful in terms of facilitating implementation. It would be disappointing for participants to go to the trouble of designing an idea and then finding out it is too expensive to actually implement.

**Long-Term Impacts**

Participants found the process to be beneficial in that it brought together different interests within the community and initiated a dialogue, especially in the community of Oliver, where there has typically been a divide between the rural area and the town. Participants were grateful for the opportunity to become more directly engaged in planning processes that affect their communities. The charrette component allowed for more community involvement in decision-making than is usually used in all three communities. This not only served to allow citizens to provide input on some local decisions, but also helped create an awareness around local planning issues and smart growth principles that will enable participants to be more informed about local planning and provide them with the tools to be stronger advocates for smart growth principles in the future. The process also seems to have created an expectation in the three communities for the public to be included in planning processes.

The SGOG partners set out a series of long-term goals to be achieved as a result of implementing the SGOG process. These goals range from reducing vehicle use and housing costs, to building more complete communities, to increasing awareness among the necessary stakeholders to ensure that smart growth and sustainability become part of the planning processes in the communities where SGOG is implemented.
While all parties consulted in the self-assessment questionnaire were confident that increased awareness among the relevant stakeholders would surely flow from the SGOG process, project management team members were less convinced about the long-term impacts on some of SGOG’s more concrete goals, such as reducing vehicle use and social issues including the cost and nature of housing and creating employment close to home. One respondent did, however, make the interesting point that it would be useful to have some means of measuring whether this increased awareness is real or perceived. However, another project partner pointed out that it is difficult to separate out the impact of the SGOG process from other factors that may influence stakeholders.

As mentioned above, the project management teams, partners, funders, and advisory members felt that the real estate industries are making a more significant effort to incorporate smart growth and sustainability principles into their practices as a result of the SGOG process in the three pilot communities; however, charrette participants felt that they had not seen evidence of this. Again, project management team members, partners, funders, and advisory members would be more aware of the development applications underway and which ones include elements of smart growth and sustainability. It would be difficult for residents to gauge the degree to which these industries are incorporating sustainability principles before these applications have come to fruition and been communicated to the public. One project management team member said that another possible reason as to why charrette participants do not feel that there has been an impact in their communities as a result of SGOG is that the public does “not generally associate the various new projects... with the SGOG process [mainly because of] the time that has elapsed since the charrette process.”

Participants in all three communities expressed concerns about the long-term impact of this project with respect to the unstable nature of political will around the issue of sustainable development. As the composition of Councils change, the priorities can also change. While the current Councils may be on board for smart growth principles, the risk is that in the long-term new councilors may not consider this to be an important concern down the road.

Project partners, advisory members, funders, and project management team members felt strongly that SGOG has served to advance the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to sustainability. This assertion was confirmed by concrete evidence revealed during the
Squamish focus group, where participants pointed to several examples of how the SGOG process is being used in planning courses at Yale University and that Ministers from China have come to BC to study the process in Squamish.

**Key Strengths**

1. **Quality of research**

   In all three case study communities, charrette participants, municipal staff, and others commented on the high quality of the research produced both by the SGOG team and its consultants.

2. **Increased awareness of smart growth and sustainable planning**

   Members of the charrette teams, municipal staff, elected officials and others directly involved in the SGOG process stated that the initiative had increased their own level of awareness of smart growth and sustainable planning, and believed this to be the case for others in their community. Those who oversaw the SGOG process in one capacity or another agreed, and suggested that people's level of awareness will only increase when more sustainable development projects are completed.

3. **The design charrette: a successful public consultation format**

   The design charrette’s round-table format, its emphasis on integrative thinking, and the encouragement almost everyone felt to think creatively and to speak up and contribute were generally seen in a very favourable light. Residents, who are not typically included in planning processes, appreciated the opportunities and expressed that they will expect a greater degree of public involvement in planning processes as a result of the SGOG initiative.

4. **A great deal of interest**

   Participants in the SGOG process in each of Maple Ridge, Squamish and Oliver, including local politicians, municipal staff and relatively diverse members of the community, all expressed a great deal of interest in the initiative. They clearly regarded it as an important, pro-active approach to ushering in sustainable approaches to land-use planning and development in their communities.
5. Valuable educational workshops

The public turn-out and response to the public forums and educational workshops in all three case-study communities were both strong and overwhelmingly positive. The events were described as extremely well organized and highly informative. The setting of targets in the community was regarded as a particularly valuable exercise.

6. Excellent facilitation skills

Participants and on-lookers alike were very impressed with the skillful facilitation that seemed to be consistently at work in the design charrettes.

Key Challenges

1. The pace of implementation

The slow pace at which the concept plans have been implemented – the small number of new developments that can be traced directly to the SGOG process to-date – in all three case study communities, has posed a challenge for maintaining momentum and enthusiasm for the initiative. Project managers, municipal staff and others are aware of several development applications currently underway that incorporate smart growth principles, but there is a lag in implementing these plans.

2. Incorporating social issues

Important social issues were left out of the SGOG process in each of Maple Ridge, Squamish and Oliver – possibly because of the composition of the charrette teams and the difficulty these issues pose for a design-oriented approach to community planning. Some of the issues that participants felt the forums, workshops and charrettes should pay more attention to included affordable housing, local employment opportunities, public safety, transit and accessibility.
3. **Keeping costs down and securing new funding**

The 10-step process in each community has turned out to be very expensive. While fundraising was not considered to be one of the initiative’s strong suits to-date, it was nevertheless recognized that the partners had successfully secured the monies necessary for the first three case study communities quite handily. However, the likelihood of maintaining current levels of funding in the future is widely seen as much less certain. The ‘funder fatigue’ that is anticipated, given SGOG’s intention to take its 10-step process to seven more BC communities and basically repeat it, demands some imaginative thinking to repackage the initiative in ways that funders will find attractive.

4. **Engaging aboriginal and ethnic communities**

Recruiting members for the charrette teams from aboriginal communities and ethnic groups remains a challenge for SGOG. Despite the fact that invitations were extended, formal presentations were made, and reserve lands were within the planning areas, only one aboriginal person participated in a charrette.

5. **Meeting communities’ unique needs**

The suggestion that the SGOG process amounted to a cookie-cutter approach to sustainable planning and development was heard in all three communities. Clearly, close attention to and respect for the unique qualities of their locality are things all communities want in the planning process.

6. **Making more of the advisory committee**

The advisory committee has not met within the last year, it has become too big, and perceptions of its value to the initiative seem to be on the decline. A better way to use the advisory committee needs to be found.

7. **Transparency and accountability**

Lack of communication around SGOG outcomes was raised as a concern by several charrette participants. Participants would have liked to know about developments underway as result of the SGOG process as a means of holding SGOG accountable for the time they spent in the charrette process. Participants also expressed that they would have liked
transparency around how decisions were made around which ideas would be carried forward to the research stage and which ones were not. Follow-up with municipal Councils, planning department staff and their communities after the Concept Plan is officially adopted, in a variety of different ways, will likely go a long way towards ensuring that smart growth really does happen ‘on the ground.’

8. The ‘SGOG’ name

The name ‘Smart Growth on the Ground’, many people suggested, is so much like Smart Growth BC that confusions commonly arise amongst the public. In addition, the present name effectively emphasizes one of the partners and de-emphasizes the other two.

Lessons Learned

1. Implementation takes longer than expected

SGOG had hoped to see ‘the shovel break the ground’ for a few development projects spurred on by their work in the partner communities. There are a variety of reasons why this has not happened. Even so, several projects now appear to be on the verge of construction in both Maple Ridge and Squamish. (Oliver’s final concept plan was only released in December 2006.) Implementation, therefore, takes more time than initially anticipated, and this fact needs to be recognized and communicated throughout the process.

2. Greater efforts to familiarize SGOG staff with the planning and development histories of partner communities will further the process

Community members are sensitive to the amount of effort SGOG staff make to familiarize themselves with the planning and development histories of their communities before they arrive. More in-depth understanding of the unique problems facing the partner communities on the part of staff will build local confidence in the rightness of the plan produced, and enhance the communities’ capacity to feel real ownership of its outcomes.
3. More follow-up with municipal Councils and planning staff after the process keeps the push on for sustainable planning and development

The case of Squamish begins to illustrate some of the benefits that can come from continuing contact with the municipal planners involved after the SGOG process itself has wound up. Smart Growth BC’s involvement in the next stages of developing the Concept Plan, on a contractual basis, has helped to keep municipal staff motivated and moving ahead with sustainable planning objectives.

4. Participants want to stay informed about SGOG’s progress in their communities

The design charrette was an exciting and motivating experience for many of the people who participated. They valued the opportunity to contribute to their community and now expect there will be ways to stay informed about the progress and outcomes of the SGOG initiative.
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

There are a number of principles that came out during the evaluation process that should be taken into consideration when making changes to the program as it is unrolled across the province. Firstly, transparency needs to be central to the process. The SGOG team needs to be clear about what ideas they will follow-up with at the end of each day of the charrette. If some ideas are not going to be carried forward to the next day, explanations need to be explicit.

Accountability should also be key to the SGOG process. Participants in the community have put a great deal of time and effort into the project, so the SGOG team needs to be accountable to both the participants and the community. This means that the team needs to clearly demonstrate and communicate changes that have occurred as a result of the SGOG process and support the implementation process to ensure that the community does in fact achieve some positive changes.

Equally as important to consider is the fact that every community is different. The process needs to allow for some flexibility to reflect local nuances. Some pre-research on the community and their local issues and concerns would allow the process to be customized as appropriate.

One of the fundamental features of the SGOG process is public involvement, and while the team does an excellent job of ensuring that everyone feels comfortable expressing and exploring their ideas, charrette inclusiveness should be fundamental to the process. Inclusiveness could be further enhanced by ensuring a wider range of stakeholders are present at the table. The SGOG team needs to take into consideration the fact that the same cast of characters often show up to public events in a community, and integrate new ways of ensuring that the voices of those stakeholders who do not come out to the charrette are incorporated and heard in the process.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these guiding principles and the findings of the evaluation process, a number of specific recommendations can be made around the SGOG process, implementation, and long-term outcomes.

**Design Brief**

The design brief is an extremely beneficial document for members of the community who do not usually participate in or have the necessary knowledge around planning processes. However, in its current format it can be overwhelming and needs to be made more user-friendly. This can be achieved primarily by creating an executive summary of the design brief, which would provide readers with an easily digestible piece that participants can use for context (approximately 12 pages). The executive summary should reference appendices, where readers can get more technical information as they require it.

**Inclusiveness**

*Representation from the Community*

It is important to have diverse representation in the SGOG process to bring legitimacy to the Concept Plans that are designed as a result of the process. The SGOG process should recognize that it is common for the same players in a community to come out to all of the community meetings. As such, the charrette will likely have the same cast of characters that are often present at other community processes and that already have a strong voice in the community. As a means of including community members who do not traditionally participate in community processes, the SGOG team should consider holding mini input sessions with particular sub-populations within the community, such as youth or a specific ethnic group, to ensure that those voices are represented in the process to make it more representative and legitimate. These sessions could be at community spaces where the sub-populations tend to congregate, such as a local place of worship, community centre, or a local high school. These mini sessions could also be held at times outside of work hours to engage people who find the timing of the charrette a barrier to participation.
Inclusion of Social Issues
Not only is it important that all relevant stakeholders are represented for the discussions, the process should ensure that the issues of key importance to the communities are discussed to the degree necessary and included in the Concept Plans. To some extent, the range of issues included in the discussions and Concept Plans will follow if all of the relevant stakeholders have a voice in the process. The fact that social issues were largely overlooked in the SGOG process was mentioned often in the SGOG evaluation. This issue could be better addressed if the process allowed for more social issues representatives, perhaps even one for each of the typically important issues, such as employment, housing, and accessibility.

Research
Some participants mentioned concern around the transparency of which ideas were carried forward for research and which were not. It could perhaps be useful to hold a brief session at the end of each day of the charrette to prioritize which ideas would be researched before the next session. This would involve keeping a list of all the ideas discussed during the day and doing a quick brainstorm as to what resources and expertise would be required to take those ideas further. At the end of the day, the list could be presented to the group. If ideas are knocked off because they are too resource-intensive, this decision should be clearly communicated to participants. Participants can then use a consensus model or a dotmocracy voting model to prioritize the ideas that would be carried forward to the research stage.

Customizing the Process
Many SGOG participants reported that the process was not tailored enough to their community and that they often felt that they were being told what to do by outside experts that are not familiar with the community. It is crucial that the SGOG team is familiar with the issues that are particular to each community in which they work in order to ensure that the process and all of its elements are appropriate for the local concerns of the community. It could be useful to have a member of the SGOG team come out to the community prior to beginning the SGOG process to do their ‘homework’ and become familiar with local issues. The team representative could spend some time with local staff, politicians, and residents, either through key informant interviews or some small focus groups, to collect some key information that can then
be incorporated into the SGOG process in the community. This makes the process appear more customized and appropriate to the community and helps ensure that the process addresses the local needs and concerns of the community. Another approach to customizing the process, as proposed by one of the project partners, could be to develop a series of templates to capture the various types of communities in BC, such as resort communities, rural/urban communities, bedroom communities, and larger urban centres. A partner also suggested that more municipal staff could be used as facilitators, which would be another means of ensuring that local issues of importance get the attention they require.

**Principles**

While most participants generally agreed with the SGOG principles, there were some concerns expressed, especially around the principle that ‘everyone has a voice’ and that the principles did not all apply in certain communities. In order to address the confusion around the principle that ‘everyone has a voice’ it might be advisable to consider rewording this principle to include language such as ‘accessible’ to better get at the intended meaning of the principle. In terms of the other principles, they were generally well-received as something that all communities should be striving for, although there was some discussion around the fact that they do not all apply in small communities, particularly principles that deal with options to the car. It could potentially be a worthwhile exercise to have a session at the beginning of the charrette to obtain consent around the principles – see if they all apply and if there are any other local issues that should be reflected in the principles. This discussion would also help ensure that all participants are clear on the intended meaning of each principle. As well, the discussion would allow for an additional means of customizing the process to mirror local concerns.

**Communication**

*Communications with the Public*

Although the developers, city staff, and city councilors are aware of the ways in which the SGOG process is being pushed ahead towards implementation, there can be a significant lag time, in which there is no evidence to residents as to what is taking place. It is important to maintain communications with residents, especially those who invested a great deal of time and energy in the charrette process. The community needs to be kept up-to-date around what is happening behind the
scenes, in terms of policy or by-law changes or specific developments that are underway. This can also serve to maintain the momentum and interest in the project, but more importantly ensures that the SGOG team is accountable to the communities where they conducted the process. Participants and the community need to see evidence of change in return for their hard work and it is SGOG’s responsibility to see that the community is aware of what has taken place as a result of the SGOG process. A regular newsletter or e-bulletin would be a method of maintaining regular contact with the community and SGOG participants and to promote SGOG related outcomes in the community.

Communications with the Advisory Committee and Project Managers
Advisory committee members are selected because of the expertise and knowledge they can contribute to the SGOG process, so it is important to make use of them. Firstly, it would be ideal if the advisory committee were to meet more frequently. There should also be a process in place to ensure that the advisory committee is communicating with the project managers in the communities to share their knowledge and provide advice. This could involve breaking the advisory out into committees, with one for each community. Each committee would be required to meet their assigned community’s project manager on a regular basis and report back on the communities’ successes, challenges, and lessons learned to the advisory committee as a whole. The advisory could then discuss ideas and solutions to challenges based on their collective knowledge of what has happened in the other communities and relay this information back to the community project managers via the appropriate committee.

Implementation

Signature Project
As a means of addressing some of the concerns around implementation, the SGOG team could consider working with each community to implement a project that could be clearly identifiable as an outcome of the SGOG process. This project would have to be a small project that could be implemented quickly, so as to keep the momentum around the process going and show that there is progress taking place during the lag time on implementing some of the larger projects. This project would also provide the opportunity for the SGOG team to work directly with the community around implementing an actual project, not just planning. It will be extremely important, in terms of accountability, that the outcomes
of this project are reported to the community, especially those who participated in the SGOG process.

Supporting the Communities in the Implementation Stage
While a signature project would provide one means of allowing SGOG to maintain a connection with the communities and support their implementation processes, another option was suggested by a project partner. This was to keep on the SGOG coordinator at 10% in each community following the development of the community’s Concept Plan. The SGOG coordinator could support the implementation process through providing advice and expertise and suggesting resources as appropriate. This add-on to the project would be extremely costly, however. Therefore, another option could be the model used in Squamish, where the community has hired SGBC as a consultant to support the implementation process, but at a cost to the community and not SGOG. This model process could be enhanced by compiling a list of appropriate consultants that communities could refer to when they need support, as well as a list of potential funding sources to help offset some of the costs of hiring a consultant to support implementation.

Maintaining Council Support
Maintaining Council support for the Concept Plan can be a challenge given that Councils change frequently. It could be worthwhile to strike up a team from among the charrette participants to be responsible for meeting with new Councils to go over the highlights of the Concept Plan with new Councils and ensure that they understand and support the principles of smart growth. The team could consist of a member of the community’s planning department, a resident, and a politician from a previous Council. This team could help continue the project’s momentum even as the political landscape may change.
APPENDIX A: CASE STUDY – MAPLE RIDGE

Getting Involved

Participants first learned about the SGOG project in Maple Ridge in various ways. The most frequently reported were reading about it in the local newspaper, hearing about it through the district, at Council or through civic politicians, and through word of mouth in the community. One participant said the mayor had asked them to contact SGOG and another had received a funding request from SGOG. Yet another explained that while he had heard about it through his involvement with the district, his agency had also marketed SGOG to others within Maple Ridge.

The reasons people became involved in SGOG in Maple Ridge also varied. One reason was that it related to their professional responsibilities. One person was involved in local real estate and wanted to be informed. Another, who was familiar with smart growth principles in his line of work, wanted to see the principles applied on the ground, to a real community. Another still identified a professional interest in development and urban design and how it affects the environment and the built environment. The opportunity to bring $300,000 of free consultation on smart growth principles to Maple Ridge and to participate in an experiment with world-class experts was also given as a reason for wanting to participate in the SGOG process.

After professional interests, the second most commonly stated reason for getting involved in SGOG was the desire to see improvements in the community, especially in the downtown area. In this connection, the importance of the downtown to the community was often mentioned, including the fact that Maple Ridge was lucky to have an historic downtown area that was relatively intact (most other lower mainland communities do not). The improvement represented by the new civic area was also noted. Also mentioned in this connection were the need to stimulate development downtown, to get a green or sustainable ‘brand’ on downtown development in order to encourage people and business to come to the area, and to get the community discussing downtown revitalization.

A personal interest in housing, disability and social issues made another person want to participate in the design charrette.
Appropriateness of the Principles

When asked whether SGOG’s eight smart growth principles were appropriate for Maple Ridge, most people replied in the affirmative, with a few endorsing them quite heartily. One noted that while there are other ways of slicing the pie, these principles resonated with the members of the charrette. Another saw their broad ranging nature as enabling people to add their own ideas, and express their own opinions. Another still said that it was best to regard them as targets because they were worth trying for but difficult to achieve anytime soon.

Others disagreed. One felt they had been forced to think in a box and would have liked some discussion in the community around the pros and cons of each principle. Validation of the principles from the community was seen as desirable in a few people’s estimation. The fact that council had endorsed the principles and that they provided a necessary structure was also noted.

One said that the lack of parking downtown was not addressed because of the principle discouraging auto-orientation. The assumption that people living downtown would not need parking overlooked the needs of people living outside of the downtown area. Another believed an additional principle was needed, namely, ‘co-operation’ (as in, the eight principles need to ‘co-operate’ with one another).

People apparently struggled to grasp the meaning of some of the principles, particularly the ones related to the spirit of the place and everyone having a voice. It was said that whereas these did not strike some people as workable principles, other ones were and they were the ones focused upon.

It was recalled that there was cynicism in the community about SGOG at the very outset of the process and that this had to do with the eight principles. Some members of the community had expressed the opinion that they were too high brow.

Inclusiveness

Representation of the Community in the Charrette

In terms of its composition, most people thought the charrette team was representative of the community at large. However, a minority believed
that representation was leaning towards business groups rather than the people who will use the businesses downtown. More residents should have been involved, one participant commented. It was also noted that none of the handful of major land owners in the downtown area were present or represented, and that more youth and young adults could have been involved. Another stated that everyone who really wanted to be involved in the process ultimately was involved.

One participant, who was able to identify all those involved in the charrette (council members, police, youth, heritage, fire, the development community, people familiar with energy issues, representatives from different levels of government), asked whether these people were actually representative of those they were meant to represent. He also wondered out loud whether they were the best ones to represent the future generations of Maple Ridge.

Few people seemed to understand how the members of the charrette had been selected. Apparently people who wanted to participate, but were not directly involved in the downtown in some capacity, were unhappy at being turned away for this reason.

One participant reported being the only member from the community group she represented who could spend the amount of time required for the charrette. Another felt the guidelines did not permit more than one representative of social issues in Maple Ridge to join the charrette. The coverage of social issues suffered in the charrette, it was said, because the one person charged with representing all social issues was knowledgeable about only a few issues (including housing and disability issues).

**Air Time for Participants in the Charrette**

With one exception, the charrette was described as relaxed, equitable, very interactive, co-operative, and team oriented. Informed extroverts tended to carry the day, it was said, but the rest of the team was encouraged to speak up too. Most participants believed that no one was left out, and because the expertise was there when it was needed, people were not left behind for this reason. One participant described discussion in the charrette as the tossing around of a lot of ideas and a coming to consensus about them. No one felt that anyone on the team was there to be disruptive.
One participant answered ‘no’ to the question, ‘Did you feel your input in the charrette was always taken into consideration?’ Concern was voiced that while opinions were heard from people who ran the charrette, but did not live in Maple Ridge, they allowed people to cut off locals who wanted to speak. The youth representative and the low-income housing advocate were apparently both in the position of being cut off, or given little time to speak. This was attributed to the youth’s age, the short amount of time available, a bias against low-income people’s housing in the downtown, and the fact that everyone wants to get their ideas heard. It was also noted that there was no room made available for rebuttal.

Issues Covered

Concern was expressed that social issues were not adequately addressed in the charrette. In particular, discussions of low-income and transitional housing were given too little time in the charrette. It was felt that social prejudices were at work and these went largely unaddressed and therefore uncorrected in the overall process. As one person stated, the opinion that low-income people were not considered good for downtown businesses seemed to hold sway, even though they spend more of their money locally than other residents. Another related criticism was that only a very small number of social issues were considered. These were the most visible ones – homelessness and drug addiction, for example – while other issues, like accessibility, were not addressed.

It was noted that the community is split on the agricultural land issue, i.e., the preservation of ALR land versus its development. In addition, the smart growth principle of encouraging development that is not oriented toward the car is a difficult one for the community, it was said, because the alternative, transit, is so poorly developed in the area. The same applies to the smart-growth preference for local employment: about 65% of the population currently leave town to work each day.

Opening Forum, Educational Workshops and Charrette

Opening Forum

The turnout to the opening forum was reportedly good. The people who usually show up to such things – the vocal element, the people who take an interest in their community – were all said to be present.
The timing was good as well. A heated discussion about the civic centre in Maple Ridge, which had just wound up, had encouraged people to care about the downtown. People realized that something more needed to happen there. Council had taken a risk in building the civic centre, it was seen as a success, and so the introduction of smart growth principles in the downtown was seen as a natural progression.

The choice of Kevan Evans as moderator was a good one in several people’s opinion. He kept it lively and kept the discussion moving forward, they said.

Workshops

Those who attended SGOG’s educational workshops reported that they were very well organized and well attended. They had also learned something new, whether it was about the history of the downtown, smart growth, or environmental issues. Several people mentioned that it was useful to see where people in the community stood on certain issues, what the community wants to see for its downtown, and what the various community groups saw as the key issues involved. One participant felt that others in attendance knew more about the process that was to unfold than she did, and said the timing of the workshops did not fit her schedule. Another was impressed by how quickly stakeholders reached consensus on the broad issues.

Several people expressed surprise at the fact that safety in the downtown was a concern for so many people. They found that business owners were nervous and felt they were not getting business because people were scared to come downtown.

Charrette

Expectations

The SGOG charrette was the first process of this kind for several of the participants. Some people in this position stated they did not know what to expect, while others were clear on what to come.

For those who had participated in a charrette before, the SGOG version was said to be basically the same, however, compared to previous experiences, the facilitation was first rate, the management was very professional, and more people were involved. One participant expressed surprise that the charrette focused so immediately and exclusively on the
downtown core – he expected the larger context of the downtown to be considered first. The idea of the hands-on design work required in the charrette was said to be an intimating factor about the process, one person allowed. (He suggested that next time more people could be assigned to support people like himself who do not have the design skills.) Another person he was surprised at what developed in the charrette at various points along the way.

Research
As for the professional expertise and research work the SGOG team offered to the design charrette, most participants had only good things to say. Some were very impressed. One said she was ‘amazed’ by what the team accomplished between meetings; she had never seen anything come together so quickly. The team’s expertise in sustainable planning and development, as well as their technical knowledge in the field, was widely recognized.

One thing that detracted from the charrette for several people was that the expertise was not held by locals, but rather by people who came from as far away as New York. These individuals were recognized as very knowledgeable people, the concern was that their expertise did not always apply to the local situation or respond to local concerns. Some commented that those from UBC seemed to have come the week before to have a look around.

Doubts about the findings in one research report (concerning retail) was expressed by one person. (The same expert had given very different recommendations to what this person took to be the same issue in another report he had seen.)

One participant noted that she really had to push the facilitators/SGOG team to get certain topics addressed in the charrette. Another felt some of the information in the charrette was incorrect. Another still suggested that the historical reasons for the community’s development patterns were not taken into account sufficiently. She said that things have happened for certain reasons in MR and these need to be understood since they have contributed to the unique community it is today. Some participants said that they though SGOG was a cookie cutter program.

Design Brief
The design brief received mixed reviews, ranging from ‘good’ and ‘pretty good’ to the admission that it had not been read because it was
overwhelming. It was too technical, one person said. People did not pay much attention to it because it was too complex for those who do not do that kind of work all the time, another said. Too conceptual was yet another criticism.

Other comments offset these criticisms somewhat – one person said it was informative, for instance. The facilitators were good in summarizing it as the team went through the process, said another. Other comments were that listening and watching the drawings during the session was more helpful than just reading the design brief. And more ‘nuts and bolts’ and more examples would have helped.

Participants generally felt that the public’s inputs at the educational workshops was fully and accurately drawn into the design brief, although a few people thought this was not the case – that there were biases against incorporating social issues, for example.

**Facilitation**

The SGOG team did a very good job at facilitating the charrette in most people’s opinion. The charrette would not have worked without the facilitators, one person said. Those who facilitated the charrette were described as good ambassadors, efficient, not overbearing, and well-rounded (they could show projects, draw architectural designs, etc.). The facilitators were described variously as well-spoken, thorough (they really took the time to ensure everyone understood the process, one person said), talented at keeping the conversation going, capable of asking probing questions, they guided rather than steered the team’s discussion, kept things on track, enthusiastic, possessed good people skills, courteous, worked as a team, and very relaxed – nobody felt they could not speak up. One participant commented that she also liked hearing the expertise that community members demonstrated in the charrette (e.g. with respect to accessibility).

Suggestions for improving the charrette included adding a fifth morning and making the process more continuous. Two people mentioned that the six-day break in the charrette was problematic in this respect.

**Conflicts**

People had differing ideas about conflict in the charrette process. Some noted that while strong opinions were voiced they did not recall any real conflict taking place. These people also expressed surprise at this
situation, crediting it to the facilitators’ skills and the respect for others amongst those around the table. Others said that while the conflict was dealt well in big groups, this was not always the case in small ones. Staff sometimes did not want to upset people, it was said, and just moved on rather than resolving issues. But not everything can be resolved, it was said.

As for the kinds of issues associated with strong disagreement, at least in some people’s minds, these revolved around environmental issues, the type of housing and the type of business most suitable for the downtown, parking, the SGBC study (The Sprawl Report), and design issues concerning the redevelopment of the mall and the downtown area. Another issue, which was implicit throughout the process, concerned the real estate and development community’s reaction to the SGOG process and its proposals. Another issue still had to do with the fact that major landowners in the downtown were not directly involved in the process. It was clear to many that because this handful of people has the ultimate say in the area’s redevelopment their participation was important. The conclusion drawn was that SGOG could not get them involved for one reason or another.

Outcomes

An obvious outcome of the design charrette was the concept plan. People seemed to be split on whether they thought the plan captured the ideas developed in the charrette fully and accurately or not. Some people thought it did. Others stated that not all the ideas they expected to find in the concept plan, based on the discussions in the charrette, did in fact show up in the final plan. Promises made at the beginning about green buildings and green infrastructure, for instance, were not carried through apparently. This was disappointing for some because they understood that local developers were enthusiastic about LEEDs, etc. Other issues that were discussed but were not in the concept plan included transit and community safety. It was noted that the charrette did not include an evaluation process to determine best possible solutions or whether proposed ideas were viable.

Building Skills in the Community

It was believed that a variety of new skills were created in the community as a result of the SGOG process. As well as a heightened awareness of smart growth, the forum, workshops and charrette were all said to have
imparted a considerable amount of knowledge about sustainable planning and development to the community. The smart growth principles alone enabled people to think about ideas they would not have considered before. The SGOG process encouraged people to see things from different perspectives, and to take a more integrated approach in their thinking.

One person remarked that the SGOG process created new skills/knowledge in the community to the extent that the people who actively participated in the process were truly representative of their constituencies. Recognizing the importance of communicating with people outside of traditional planning and development circles is a valuable lesson to learn, she argued. It was also remarked that young people’s increasing input into community affairs means new ideas and new ways of thinking are getting into the mix.

**Implementation**

The question, ‘What evidence do you see so far that sustainable development has actually occurred ‘on the ground’ in your community?’, elicited conflicting responses. Some people were adamant that nothing has happened yet, by which they meant no new building had taken place subsequent to and in accordance with the SGOG process. Disappointment was expressed about this, given the length of time since the plan’s approval by Council. Disappointment was also expressed that the same kinds of business licenses are being approved in the downtown area as before the SGOG process.

While someone insisted that some buildings had gone up since SGOG, others argued that these would have been built anyway. Rather, it seemed that a number of new developments that respect the SGOG concept plan have been approved by council, but have yet to break ground. For instance, there are apparently 225 residential units in the downtown area that have been approved over this past year (on 224th Avenue). The process of making 224th more pedestrian friendly is also about to begin. In addition, the city has recently purchased a piece of property north of the town core to connect some of the walkways as well. These three things apparently follow the concept plan.

Several regulatory changes consistent with the SGOG plan have reportedly taken place, however. As a result, developers proposing downtown developments must now demonstrate that they are ‘green’ in
some way. A number of developers are currently trying for silver or bronze level certification with LEEDS. There have also been development control cost relaxations and density bonuses awarded for green/LEEDS buildings. In addition, SGOG has been fully incorporated in the official community plan now. It was remarked, finally, that there have certainly been changes in how council and the community discuss the redevelopment of the downtown.

**Long-Term Impacts**

One of the long-term impacts the SGOG process is expected to exert in Maple Ridge is to reshape the structure of local government operations as they relate to planning policies, by-laws (including the zoning by-law) and practices.

SGOG is also expected to revitalize the community's downtown core, the long-term impacts of which are seen as significant. If the plan is achieved, there will be a vibrant core to the community with a lot of activity on the streets, spruced up commercial properties, a substantial residential population, a sizable number of jobs, and greater public safety. If it succeeds it will get people out of their cars, using the walkways from surrounding areas into the core, and the riverside trails. One person surmised that if it achieved all these things in the long term, the downtown would also attract a convention centre, a gaming centre and a cluster of nice restaurants.

Another long-term impact is a new mindset in Maple Ridge about its downtown. As a result of SGOG, people now understand that decisions made elsewhere have an impact on the downtown. They also know that decisions need to be taken that shore up the importance of the downtown.

So far, SGOG has provided a reason for the community to define the boundaries of its downtown, and this is recognized as the first step. The feeling is the downtown will not be lost altogether now. Realistically, it is expected to take 10 years before much is built in the area.

**Becoming a model for public consultation in sustainable development planning**

Participants in Maple Ridge believed that the SGOG process differed from the usual planning processes in their community in several respects. The
process was more of a blank slate, people said; a developer's proposal was not before them to be considered; they took the lead in the charrette themselves (with the facilitators' help, of course). It was recognized as definitely more systematic and thorough than the talking-off-the-top-of-your-head that developers and councilors usually undertake on planning matters in council chambers. Others pointed out that smart growth forces the community to look at infill sites, rather than simply going with green field sites. It has involved a greater emphasis on area plans than usual, and certainly on a more diverse group of people than usually participates in planning processes. Finally, participants believed it has given the community a new set of guidelines to develop around.

The SGOG process was thought to possess many of the attributes necessary for a model for public involvement in planning for sustainable development in BC – provided that all groups are represented fairly, it was said. Participants believe that it is easy for processes like these to get hijacked by the squeaky wheel, so SGOG needs to go forward in a very inclusive way. The facilitation involved is regarded as the most efficient way to gain representative stakeholder consensus.

Participants also identified a few ways that SGOG falls short of becoming such a model. For one thing, they said, the initiative was billed on the promise of implementation as well as public consultation - and it did not end up this way. It has been a getting-started initiative in Maple Ridge so far, it was said. SGOG needs to facilitate some of the implementation, participants decided. There need to be additional phases in the community.

The SGOG team also needs to take special care in respecting the local character of the community involved. Finally, the initiative is seen as limited because of its land use and urban design focus. There was a need perceived amongst the participants for other issues that are part of the larger sustainability picture to be taken seriously too - like local heritage, social issues, and amenities, for example. What is left out of sustainable development when SGOG is the focus, they wanted to know.
APPENDIX B: CASE STUDY – SQUAMISH

Getting Involved

Participants in the Squamish SGOG process heard about the project in different ways. Many read about it in the newspaper, but others heard about the project through a charrette process organized by the Fraser Basin Council to look at the Squamish downtown and waterfront area. In some cases, connections to the process were made directly through Smart Growth BC, where some participants were contacted directly by the SGOG partner organization or through other involvement with the organization (e.g. Smart Growth BC newsletter and website). Other participants were contacted and asked to participate by municipal staff.

Many participants in Squamish were already aware of the smart growth principles through existing relationships with Smart Growth BC and were interested in the opportunity to apply these principles in their community. Property owners, on the other hand, felt like this process was happening no matter what, so it was better to be involved. Participants liked that the process involved drawing in the community in a way that has not happened before in Squamish in terms of planning. People were also attracted to the availability of resources with no costs to the municipality to do top notch planning. Generally, participants cared about the development of the downtown area and wanted to be involved in this process.

 Appropriateness of the Principles

The fact that many participants in Squamish were drawn to the SGOG process because of an interest in the smart growth principles speaks to the fact that principles were by and large appropriate for the community. However, some participants would have liked to have seen a greater emphasis on social issues, such as job creation. Some people feel that these principles might be difficult to achieve, but that they are something the community should be striving to accomplish.
Inclusiveness

Representation

Most participants said that everyone who wanted to be part of the process was there. They felt that it was great to have such a diverse group, as it validates the Concept Plan. Participants in Squamish were pleased that there was a strong turn out of staff from the District of Squamish. They felt that this was important because bureaucrats play a key role in steering Council. Generally, participants felt that there was a good cross-section of sectors represented at the charrette.

Participants did, however, point to some gaps in the representation. Many participants would have liked to have seen more councilors present at the session. As well, some participants felt that some of the citizens groups should have had more representatives. Some of the social issues that are of concern in the community were lumped together. For example, affordable housing is a serious issue in Squamish and some participants felt that this issue did not have a strong voice because it was lumped together with other social issues. One participant pointed out that it would have been beneficial to have First Nations representatives participating in the process, as well.

There was some concern that some people who wanted to participate as residents were not able to because they could not get four days off work. Others could not make it to the whole charrette, so they came and went, which some felt was disruptive to the discussion.

Some participants suggested that it would have been useful to have some time built into the charrette, where representatives could go back to the groups they were representing (such as developers, land owners, social interest groups) to consult on their opinions throughout the charrette process.

Air Time

Although there were strong agendas that tried to take over the SGOG process, participants said that the SGOG team did an excellent job of managing this to ensure that everyone had an equal voice at the charrette. Participants found the process to be extremely inclusive of all interests involved in the charrette. People felt that no one person was
able to dominate and participants felt free to speak out on issues. Participants indicated that they felt comfortable throwing ideas out.

There was one complaint that a particular interest was not given equal considerations. Specifically, the outdoor recreation interests were not given equal air time, but this was likely because it happens for the most part out of downtown. In that way, the inclusion of the outdoor recreation interests was a bit of a mismatch.

**Issues Covered**

Participants were all impressed with how many issues got addressed in the short time allocated for the charrette. However, some participants were disappointed that some of the more social aspects of sustainability were overlooked in the SGOG process, especially around employment. They pointed out that the smart growth principles are supposed to be holistic, but these issues are overlooked. One participant said that the process advocates for increasing density, but does not consider where all of these new residents will work. The participants do recognize, however, that these principles would be less tangible to measure, making it more appealing to focus on issues such as density.

Given that Squamish is located along the highway from Vancouver to Whistler, some participants would have liked to have more discussion around what projects would make the downtown more appealing to tourists. Currently, most visitors pass through the town as they make their way to and from Whistler, so participants would have liked to have discussed what would make passer-bys want to stay in downtown Squamish.

Some participants pointed out that there was little cost-analysis built into the process. They would have liked to have known how much some of these projects would cost. This information could have helped in prioritizing projects and to determine which ones were actually feasible. One participant said that some ideas were shut-down because the group thought they would be too expensive without knowing the actual costs. Participants said they would have liked to have seen costing for environmental clean-ups and infrastructure outlined in the design brief. It was suggested that the SGOG team could have taken some examples from other communities experiencing a similar transition from a resource-based economy to a tourist-based economy to provide some ideas and sense of costing. Some participants did point out that it would be difficult
to provide complete cost-analyses, as a lot of the designs were not
detailed enough at that stage.

Participants were disappointed to see that some of their ideas were not
carried forward into the actual Concept Plan. For example, the idea
about a passenger vessel between the US and Squamish was not taken
into consideration, nor was the discussion around recreation
incorporated. Some participants also felt that ideas were carried forward
into the Concept Plan despite a lack of consensus on the issue, such as
the ideas around the marina.

Some of the small groups felt that they were looking at some topics in
greater detail than what was reflected in the Concept Plan. For instance,
the urban design group was looking at detailed materials for some of
their ideas, but they did not have enough time to bring these issues back
to the group as a whole, so the detail was lost in the Concept Plan.

Participants were pointed to a number of ideas and discussions that were
overlooked for the Concept Plan. Particularly, participants felt that the
discussions around alternatives to the bridge were not included in the
Concept Plan. Participants also felt that they did a lot of work around
road infrastructure and Highway 7 that was also missed in the Plan.
Participants would have also liked to have seen a separate chapter in the
Concept Plan highlighting some of the ideas that would take place outside
of the study area, but still have an impact on the downtown area.

Opening Forum, Educational Workshops and Charrette

Opening Forum

Many participants were brought into the SGOG process in Squamish after
the Opening Forum. Among those who did attend, they felt that it was
well-organized, professionally run, and informative.

Educational Workshops

Participants felt that the educational workshops were important for laying
out the context of how the SGOG process would unfold in Squamish and
generated some excitement around the project. Participants indicated
that they learned about the demographic and geographic trends that
would be relevant to the SGOG discussion, as well as more details about
the smart growth principles and how these trends and principles apply to
Squamish, which was especially important to those who do not typically participate in planning processes. Whereas the typical planning process involves government designing the plans and then defending it, participants especially appreciated that these educational workshops took the community’s priorities into consideration. Participants felt that they had meaningful opportunities for input in these workshops, which was important given the wide variety of stakeholders in attendance.

Charrette

Expectations
Most of the participants in Squamish had participated in a charrette process prior to the SGOG charrette because the Fraser Council Basin had conducted a similar process in Squamish already. However, the SGOG charrette was much more comprehensive, especially in that the goal of the process was to create one plan, rather than three separate plans, as has happened in the past in Squamish. Participants also felt that they got a good road map of what the charrette process would look like through the educational workshops. As a result, most participants said that the charrette process was more or less what they expected.

There were some surprises, however. Firstly, participants were surprised, in a good way, about the ideas that were drawn out during the charrette process. Participants also discussed how during the process, it did not feel like they were getting anywhere because they could not see the final products, but in the end the information all came together.

On the other hand, some people were taken aback that some new stakeholders were introduced to the charrette part way through the process. These new stakeholders carried a strong voice, despite having not been present for the previous discussions. Some participants were also frustrated that the structure of the charrette involved breaking up into small groups. Participants felt that the way the groups were divided cut across people’s areas of interest and that the teams, being arranged around thematic areas, meant that it was difficult to integrate ideas. Participants did understand, though, that this was necessary in order to cover all the ground that needed to be addressed in the charrette.

Research
Participants were incredibly impressed with the research work carried out by the SGOG team. People were surprised what the team was able to
pull together in such a short time. Participants felt that the team had a remarkable range of expertise available.

One issue that came up in Squamish was the lack of transparency around which issues the SGOG team would research and create designs for. One participant said that he had asked for some research around a particular idea and he was told it was outside of their budget. Participants felt that it was unclear what the SGOG team was going away to research each night and which ideas they would come back with designs for. Participants were unsure if the team was reluctant to research some ideas because of the cost or access to data.

There were mixed messages reported during the evaluation process with regards to the local expertise of the SGOG team. Some participants said that the SGOG team had a good grasp on the local issues and had done their homework, while other participants disagreed. Those who disagreed were concerned that the SGOG team was making assumptions that did not apply to the community.

**Design Brief**

Participants said the design brief did provide some good background information on the community. They felt that the small group discussions could also move forward because there were enough materials to support the ideas being suggested. Participants described the design brief as educational and inclusive.

Many participants felt that the design brief was not used to the extent it could have been in the charrette. Some felt this was the case because the design brief was overwhelming in terms of the amount of information captured in it. One participant suggested that an executive summary would have been helpful to digest some of the materials. Participants would have liked the high level points to be distilled and communicated to allow for more engagement with the document.

Participants did point out that it was difficult to set targets for some of the principles, as some involved issues that were less tangible, which made it difficult to capture all of the details discussed in the educational workshops for the design brief. This was especially the case with the social issues. As a result, issues such as affordable housing were difficult to address in the physical plan.
Facilitation

Overall, the participants were very positive about the SGOG team’s facilitation skills. Although the team members varied in their styles, the participants found the facilitators to be professional and organized. Participants thought that the facilitators were particularly strong in terms of keeping to the agenda and moving the discussion forward. Participants also felt that the facilitators were informed about some of the local issues that are important to the community of Squamish. Participants also pointed out that the facilitators were excellent at bringing people into the discussion who may have otherwise stuck to the sidelines.

There was some debate amongst participants as to how to balance discussion and design. Some felt that it is easier for participants to reflect on something concrete, although others were more comfortable with the discussion rather than the design exercises and saw the design pieces as more of a way of summarizing the discussion. They thought that if you leaped into design exercises too quickly, it could appear as though the SGOG team came in with preconceived notions about what the Concept Plan should look like.

Conflicts

Participants felt for the most part that the stakeholders worked well together towards achieving consensus. Although, there were some sources of conflict, they generally resulted in compromise. Participants recognized that conflicts will always arise in these processes and in the end; the conflicts were positive in that they opened up the floor to differing perspectives. Some examples of conflicts were around the highway and the bridge to downtown. Participants felt that the facilitators handled all of the conflicts well.

One particular conflict arose around the issue that some developers joined the charrette part way through. Some participants felt that they hijacked the process and changed the dynamic. One participant thought that this conflict could have been avoided if participants commit to being present the whole time if they wish to participate in the process.
Outcomes

Building Skills in the Community

Participants felt that one of the key accomplishments of the SGOG process is that it has created a more educated public. Participants now have the skills to recognize good planning and expect higher standards in this area. The process has also created a public expectation for more community involvement in future planning processes. The process also served to build up pride in the community. As well, one participant said that community members now have a better appreciation for mapping exercises. Participants said that they hope that these skills are brought back to their workplaces and applied there, as well.

The District of Squamish staff also learned some important skills from the SGOG process. Participants felt that city staff now have a better sense of how to integrate sustainable development into their planning. The staff have also learned methods for public engagement, not just consultation. This transfer of skills to the public gave the city staff the confidence to loosen the reins on the planning processes and involve the public in a deeper way.

Implementation

Participants did express some concern over the extent to which these new skills are being used in the community because they have yet to see any parts of the Concept Plan actually implemented. Although participants recognized that there is typically a two-year lag on implementing projects, they said that they would have liked to have some follow-up to keep them informed of any progress, especially for the residents who are not in the know about what is being done in the planning department. For instance, participants were pleased to hear at the evaluation focus group that the Squamish Official Community Plan (OCP) will include the eight smart growth principles as of June 2007, but wondered how residents are to know that this has occurred unless they have attended Council meetings. They feel that they spent a lot of time designing the Concept Plan and would like to be informed as changes occur. Participants also discussed how it would be beneficial if SGOG maintained some connection with the community in order to keep the momentum going and support the planners and developers in implementing the smart growth principles on a more on-going basis.
While residents were more pessimistic about seeing any of their work implemented, municipal staff pointed out that there has been some movement in the community towards implementing the principles. Firstly, the planning department has seen more building applications with some aspects of sustainable development incorporated into the proposals. They have also seen more councilors advocating for compact development. As well, the planning department is starting to see natural storm water retention through the development application process.

Participants discussed that momentum could have been maintained for the process had there been a signature project. The signature project should have been something that could be implemented quickly. One participant suggested having a signature project in the works before the charrette, so that it can be fully implemented soon after the charrette.

One roadblock to implementation is that not all municipal staff have bought into the plan. Whereas the planning department is well-aware of the Concept Plan, participants specifically mentioned the engineering department as a department that has not incorporated the smart growth principles into their projects. Participants were also concerned about the lack of support for the project on the part of local politicians. And while some councilors are currently interested in smart growth principles, this could change with the next election. Many participants in Squamish pointed to the lack of champions as a major barrier to implementing the Concept Plan. They felt that if there was a strong champion or group of champions, the process would be further along by now. Participants felt strongly that someone needs to lead the process, and that person cannot be a developer – it needs to be local politicians or a SGOG representative.

One participant suggested that it would be useful to have some measurement of indicators to show progress towards achieving the smart growth principles. Having benchmarks and measuring change around the smart growth principles would help tie changes in the community to the principles and ensure that the SGOG team is accountable to the community. These changes in indicators would have to be reported back to the community, so that they can see that there has actually been change in terms of implementation and policy. In addition to the indicators, this participant suggested that there be a set of key milestones laid out at the beginning of the process. As these milestones are achieved, this information should be reported back to the community. The examples of milestones provided included: Council adopting the
Concept Plan, the Concept Plan is incorporated to the OCP, and the signature project is implemented.

Some participants thought that a focus group with Council would be useful to help ensure that councilors are aware of the plan and understand it. A focus group session would encourage questions. There was some concern around the legislative rules prohibiting councilors to attend certain types of meetings, so others suggested holding a community workshop to present the Concept Plan and to invite councilors.

Participants mentioned the overlapping roles of different levels of government in supporting implementation. While there was a lot of talk about the need for municipal Council members to support the project, some participants pointed out that some of these projects will involve overlapping jurisdictions and need support and resources from the federal and provincial governments, as well. One participant also suggested that the provincial and federal governments could provide incentives to communities to help encourage implementation.

**Long-Term Impacts**

Participants identified a number of potential positive long-term impacts of the SGOG process, should the Concept Plan be implemented. Participants said they think the process will have a lasting impact if it does become officially incorporated into the OCP. As well, as discussed previously, the process has served to raise the bar in terms of the community’s expectations around sustainable development. As a result, the community will demand more planning that integrates smart growth principles.

Participants also mentioned that the SGOG process has served to increase Squamish’s international reputation. Ministers from China have toured Squamish to study the community’s sustainable development projects. Yale University has also recognized the work the community has done and incorporated it into a case study in an urban design course.

Another long-term impact that will be beneficial for the community is that Squamish now has ties with notable organizations such as Natural Resources Canada and West Coast Environmental Law. The process allowed for networking with staff at these two organizations, which have
now provided the community with free resources and support to continue its sustainable development work.

**Becoming a Model for Public Consultation in Sustainable Development Planning**

Participants in Squamish said that they feel the SGOG process has what it takes to become a model for public consultation in sustainable development planning. Participants especially liked the principles and the framework. Participants mentioned some examples of how the process is already being used as a model in BC and North America. They mentioned that the SGOG process is now included in the curriculum at the University of Victoria and it is being used as a model for rebuilding communities destroyed in the US during hurricane Katrina.

Participants did convey some apprehension, however, about the process becoming a model in that they think it needs to be more flexible for the specifics of a particular community. One person suggested that it could be useful to create an inventory of key assets and challenges in the community up front to highlight the different issues that need to be considered in the charrette process. This inventory would also help provide the outside experts and the residents who are not typically involved in planning with some good contextual information.

One participant recommended that the process involve a branding of the community. For example, Squamish is moving away from its roots as a community that was based in natural resources and is unclear as to where it should go. This participant said that it would have been useful to decide on a vision or brand for the community to set the direction for the discussion.

In addition, as discussed above, participants felt that SGOG should continue to support the community after the Concept Plan is complete to facilitate implementation. With the current model, the municipality is left with these huge projects that can take years to implement. The municipality will likely need resources and support to follow-through on the implementation.
APPENDIX C: CASE STUDY – OLIVER

Getting Involved

Participants in Oliver became familiar with the SGOG project in various ways. Members of City Council and the District of Oliver staff heard about the project through direct contact with the SGOG team, as many of the city staff were involved in submitting the application to be one of the three pilot communities. Residents, on the other hand, mostly heard about the project through coverage in the local newspaper. Some residents and city staff said that they have been following smart growth concepts for a while, so heard about the project through their existing relationships with Smart Growth BC.

This existing interest in smart growth principles is what attracted a number of participants to the project. City staff also thought that the SGOG process would be a good means of ensuring that community interests were brought to the table. More specifically, however, the District of Oliver is on the verge of growth, which will lead to competition over the area’s agricultural land, and many participants saw this project as a means of addressing the desire for growth while protecting agricultural land proactively. Many people were also drawn to the fact that the SGOG process offers outside expertise around cutting-edge planning that could have practical applications for the District of Oliver. It was believed that access to this expertise would allow Oliver to be avant-garde the area of sustainable planning and perhaps develop some profile for the community. Participants also saw this process as a means of improving the relationship between rural and urban residents in Oliver, as well as creating awareness around planning issues.

Appropriateness of the Principles

While participants felt that most of the principles apply to their community, there was some concern about the appropriateness of certain principles. For example, some participants were concerned about the principle around having jobs close to home in that the community does not want box stores, which would be a means of increasing employment locally. As well, a number of the principles do not apply to the rural community that is part of Greater Oliver, such as having a bus system through the rural parts. Residents felt that the nature of the rural
atmosphere is that it is more car-dependent and it is difficult to give up your car in a rural setting.

There were a number of comments around the fact that the principles were more applicable to a larger urban setting and not a smaller town. For instance the principle around complete communities is more appropriate in a larger urban centre than in a small town, where there are not going be small live/work/play nodes dispersed around the city. The scale of the community makes the principles a little less appropriate.

Participants also felt that issues such as safety and clean water should have been incorporated into the principles. Participants were particularly concerned around the area of protection of agriculture and felt that this should have been heavily emphasized in the principles. The community participants felt that there was reluctance on the part of the SGOG team to adapt the principles to make them more appropriate to the community of Oliver. Others felt the principles were appropriate, in that they should be applied to all communities, and Oliver in particular, given that the community is beginning to feel growth pressures.

There was also some misunderstanding around the principle that everyone is to have a voice. While participants assumed that this meant that the public should be consulted in planning processes, the SGOG team was actually referring to accessibility.

Inclusiveness

Representation

The participants in the evaluation process identified a number of community stakeholders that were not at the charrette, but that should have been included. According to participants, the lack of representation from the Osoyoos Indian Band (OIB) was a major hole. The OIB did do a presentation at one of the educational workshops about their plans to encourage development on their land, but there were no OIB representatives at the charrette to discuss the impacts of this proposed development on the plans being developed for Oliver. Participants also pointed to the lack of representation from the Sikh community and the fact that the economic development officer was not invited. Others mentioned that the social/educational team could have had more representation.
Many participants would have liked to see more residents participating, as more local voices would have helped legitimate the process. Many participants indicated that they felt vastly out-numbered by experts coming in from outside of the community.

Participants did feel that there was a good balance between urban and rural representatives, which is important for the Oliver community. They also felt that efforts were made to invite youth, but that this is always a difficult group to engage, especially given that the charrette took place during school hours. The participants felt that seniors were involved in the process. Participants were also pleased to see that representatives from Council, including the mayor and some councilors, made the effort to participate in the SGOG process and charrette. On the other hand, one participant felt that the regional district staff could have had a stronger presence.

In terms of including these specific interest groups within Greater Oliver, one participant said that all you can do is invite people, but if they do not show up, the SGOG team needs to make the effort to go out and actively communicate with these groups so as to engage some representatives. For example, one participant suggested going to the high schools and holding a focus group there to engage the youth. Another participant said that it should not really be up to the SGOG team to recruit participants, as they are coming from outside the community and will not know who the key stakeholders are and how to approach them. This participant said that it would be useful to have the district staff do the bulk of the recruiting, especially around engaging residents.

**Air Time**

Participants in Oliver felt very strongly that the SGOG team brought a very rigid program to Oliver, some calling it a cookie-cutter approach. The SGOG team wanted to deal with certain issues, and participants felt that some other good ideas were not discussed to the extent necessary because the SGOG team was focused on certain ideas, such as removing parking and making the highway a real highway. Participants also felt that a great deal of time was spent on ideas that were not realistic, such as some of the ideas for the wine village or the loop in the river, doing up maps and pictures, whereas that time could have been spent on more feasible ideas. In short, participants did not feel that they had the opportunity to guide the discussion around what they felt was important for the community. It was suggested in the interviews that the experts
may have fixated on the issues that they were most comfortable with, causing the other ideas put forth by the community members to fall aside.

Participants felt that they asked for some additional resources that were not provided. For instance, they asked for soil maps to overlay the maps being designed during the charrette, but the SGOG team would not comply with this request. The charrette team felt that the emphasis should be on more than building the ALR, but also knowing where the good soils are. Another issue the residents wanted addressed in the charrette that was overlooked was the agricultural resort area. Residents were told by the experts that they could help out with this, but the discussion never fell on that topic in the end.

One participant pointed out that the residents at the charrette were not privy to all of the information about planning issues that affect the community. One participant felt that he was shut down over an idea because the district staff did not think that it would work, without explaining some of the underlying development plans and policies that were already in place. This sometimes gave off the impression that decisions had already been made and that the residents were just going through the motions.

Other participants felt that there was a good balance between allowing some ideas to be expressed to the extent necessary, but also allowing the process to move along. In a short period of time, it was important that there is some structure to the discussion that keeps it moving forward to allow time for all of the important issues that need to be addressed. Generally, most felt that participants’ contributions were respected by the SGOG team and that people were able to express their opinions and then come to consensus. Participants expressed a great appreciation for this opportunity for discussion and to see other people’s perspectives on issues that affect the community.

Some participants pointed out that the small group format allowed participants to feel more comfortable expressing their opinions. The small group format also allowed participants more time to focus on the particular issues that they were addressing and reach consensus.
Issues Covered

One issue that was not covered during the charrette process was around the town boundaries. This issue, however, was very political and city staff and politicians were reluctant to address it in this particular setting. Other participants felt that the issues of employment and governance were also overlooked in the discussions. Another participant said that she would have liked to know more about accessibility issues in the community, and suggested that it would have been useful to have more local interest groups come out to the session to present their points of view and educate the charrette team about their areas of interest. Participants did recognize, however, that the project had tight timelines and that not all issues could be given full attention.

Another participant pointed out that the issue of financing was not covered in the charrette. Specifically, the participant was concerned that there was not discussion of costing out projects to ensure that they can realistically be implemented within the city’s budgets. Some participants pointed to the general topic of implementation as being overlooked, with the process being too heavy on the planning side.

For the most part, however, participants felt that the issues discussed at the charrette were accurately reflected in the draft Concept Plan.

Opening Forum, Educational Workshops and Charrette

Opening Forum

Participants were mostly pleased with the turn out at the opening forum, with approximately 75 people in attendance. Participants also liked the range of presenters available at the forum. As well, the forum provided an excellent opportunity to set the vision for the process and lay out expectations and directions.

However, the opening forum left some participants a little uneasy in that they got the impression that the SGOG team was not aware of some of the planning already underway in the community. These participants felt that the SGOG team had not done their homework on the specific issues affecting the community, especially around the rural and town dynamics. Participants were left worried that they would end up in a situation where they were going to lose autonomy over decision-making to people from outside of the community. This led to some resentment for the process.
Educational Workshops

Participants generally felt that the workshops were useful for getting people excited about the project. They also felt that the workshops opened up the discussion for different perspectives on local issues and get a sense of the issues that were of importance to the community. Others felt that the workshops were good for teaching the connection between planning and the reality of the local community - connecting theory and practice. Participants also appreciated the information they learned from the various presenters, including information about climate change, water availability, agro-tourism, and the OIB development plan.

Charrette

Expectations
Most participants felt that the SGOG team was very clear about what would be involved in the charrette, as well as the timeframe. They felt that the roadmap was very clear. There was some concern, however, around how the groups would be split up. But generally, participants felt that the charrette unfolded as they expected.

Many participants felt that they knew what to expect because they had attended charrette processes in the past. Others knew what to expect as they felt that the charrette was similar to other processes already in place in the community. The briefing book also helped to demonstrate to participants which topics would be addressed.

Research
Participants were generally incredibly impressed with the resources available throughout the charrette process. They felt that the SGOG team had an impressive range of expertise to ensure that the process could move ahead. Participants were especially impressed with the speed with which the experts were able to take what they heard during the day and find the necessary resources to carry the process forward the next day. Participants also felt that the SGOG team was responsive to errors in the research discovered by community members, such as the projections around land use, in that the team was quick to fix those mistakes.

What participants would have liked to have seen more of were examples of what has worked well in other communities. They would have liked
some case studies, including lessons learned from places where similar initiatives had been implemented.

Participants also felt very strongly that the SGOG team should have been more prepared with knowledge of what was already underway in terms of planning in the community. Participants mentioned a few examples of ideas that were discussed in the charrette, such as the wine village, that were already in motion. Some felt that SGOG took credit for these ideas, even though re-zoning and other activities were already underway to make these projects a reality.

Another issue that came up was the technical aspects of the research. Some participants felt that the information was too complicated for the average person, such as the population density projections and the mapping exercises. Participants would have liked to have been more familiar with the sources for the projections.

**Design Brief**
Participants felt that the design brief provided good context for the charrette, especially given that not all participants were familiar with all of the issues. They described the design brief as excellent and comprehensive.

Some participants felt that there was too much information in the design brief. As a result, it was difficult to find exactly what they were looking for during the charrette. Participants felt that the materials could have been a bit more focused, including only resources needed to move the charrette process along. People are busy and do not have time to read through such a large and comprehensive document thoroughly. Participants would have simply liked to see some highlighted points to follow along with during the process to make it more user-friendly. On the other hand, some participants felt that they could have used some more information on certain topics, such as the environment and water use. Some pointed out that the issues related to the rural area were under-emphasized in the design brief.

**Facilitation**
Participants were pleased with how the charrette was facilitated, saying that the facilitators were very professional and well-organized. The facilitators were good at ensuring that everyone had equal chance to share their ideas. Participants felt that the facilitators did a good job of keeping the process on track and moving forward to cover all the ground
that needed to be covered, while allowing for some flexibility to address issues or conflicts that arose.

Conflicts

According to participants, there were a number of conflicts that arose during the charrette process, at times getting quite heated and emotional. The primary conflict had to do with the fact that the rural representatives felt that their issues were being overlooked. Other conflicts emerged around the design of the main street, especially having to do with the boulevard of trees, and the water feature in the river, both of which community members did not feel were feasible.

However, many participants recognized that conflict is inherent to this type of community process and that it is important to get people's perspectives on the table, even if it does cause friction. The participants felt that they were able to come to a consensus around most of the issues, and that the facilitators handled the conflicts well. The participants felt that the facilitators were responsive to conflicts that arose, such as the case where the charrette participants misunderstood the meaning of the principle around everyone having a voice during a dotmocracy exercise. When the participants pointed out that they had misunderstood, the facilitators allowed the exercise to be repeated. In the end, participants reported that they have a better understanding of other people's perspectives.

Outcomes

Building Skills in the Community

When asked if the SGOG process has created new skills in the community in terms of planning for sustainable development, participants primarily pointed out that the process created an increased awareness around the concept of smart growth. Participants feel that both residents and district staff have benefited from this increased awareness. People who participated in the process are now talking about sustainable development and the smart growth principles with others in the community, so the word is spreading beyond just those who participated. People are now thinking about what they want for their town. The process has provided the community with a new lens with which to look at proposed development projects. Another positive skill gained through this process was that the community got experience getting together and
hearing what each other had to say. One participant said that this relationship building was especially strong between residents and elected officials.

While some people appreciated the outside perspectives of the SGOG team, the issue around taking credit for plans already underway in the community came up in this discussion again. As well, some felt that the skills transferred to the community were too Lower Mainland, or larger urban centre, focused and that the skills needed to be more appropriate for the size and nature of the community.

Implementation

Being the third of the three pilot SGOG communities, the Concept Plan for Oliver was still in draft form at the time of the evaluation process. As such, participants did not have any great expectations about seeing the plan actually being implemented. While district staff and elected officials did point to some examples of smart growth initiatives that have taken place or that are underway, such as changes to the secondary suites by-law and up-zoning of duplexes, there was debate as to whether these were already occurring on their own or whether they were as a result of the SGOG process. Participants recognized that there is a lag time in actually implementing the initiatives discussed during the SGOG process.

Long-Term Impacts

Participants identified a number of positive long-term benefits that will result from the SGOG process. Firstly, the process has provided new tools for Council and district staff to apply to their existing planning processes. As previously mentioned, some smart growth initiatives were already underway in the community, but the process served to reaffirm that these initiatives are in fact positive and gave the community the confidence to move ahead with them. Participants felt that this process has also served to increase the profile of Greater Oliver. The process also kicked off an important discussion at a crucial time in the development of the district that will hopefully be carried through as the district faces its upcoming growth challenges. This process was particularly important for bringing together the rural and urban residents. Participants said that the SGOG process has also encouraged district staff to include open houses as part of their planning processes. Another important long-term impact is that participants feel that the increased awareness around the fact that the land base is finite and that the community needs to think about
densification which will lead to controls on the urban sprawl that is currently occurring in the community.

The challenge, however, is to see if future Councils adhere to the smart growth principles and continue to carry out the Concept Plan. Participants are concerned that the plan may fall to the side as development pressures increase. Some participants were also concerned that there may be ‘cherry picking’ in terms of which aspects of the plan and which principles are actually applied to the community.

Becoming a Model for Public Consultation in Sustainable Development Planning

Participants in Oliver felt that the SGOG process differed from existing planning processes in their community in that this process was much more comprehensive in terms of the issues covered throughout the process. Participants also felt that this model relies more heavily on input from the residents than existing models, which they saw as positive. Participants said that typically development proposals are only made public once the decisions have already been made, but the SGOG process allows citizen input before official decisions are made. Having the excellent resources and experts available throughout the process was also seen as an asset that set the process apart from existing ones.

In terms of becoming a model for public consultation in sustainable development planning in BC, some participants felt that this model is more appropriate for larger urban areas. Others felt that with some fine-tuning, the SGOG process has potential to be a model. Specifically, participants felt that someone should come out to the community prior to the Opening Forum to become better acquainted with the issues facing the community and the local areas of concern.
APPENDIX D: SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Self-Assessment Questionnaires

In order to gather perceptions of those involved in the three communities about the SGOG approach and partnerships, two self-assessment questionnaires were administered. The first questionnaire was directed at SGOG advisory members, staff, project partners, funders, and staff. The second questionnaire was similar to the first, but was directed more at the community level, as the survey was administered to members of the project management teams in Squamish and Maple Ridge (Oliver does not have a project management team). The questionnaires inquired about perceptions of how resources were utilized, opportunities for improving efficiency, governance and reporting relationships, and other operational issues. Using Survey Monkey software, the assessments were administered via e-mail. In total, there was a 30% response rate among project management committee members and a 43% response rate among SGOG staff, partners, advisory members, and funders. Four advisory members indicated that they had either joined the committee since its last meeting or had not been involved for quite a while and, therefore, declined to fill in the survey.

Summary of the SGOG Advisory Members and Partners Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Preliminary Questions

Since this survey was administered to project partners, staff, funders, and advisory members, the majority of respondents identified with all three of the pilot communities. However, some respondents did indicate that they identified more with one community in particular.
Table 1: Community association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over one third of respondents said that they were project partners, and an additional 37.5% identified themselves as advisory committee members. Most of the remaining 25% of respondents were funders.

Table 2: Role in SGOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project partner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee member</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/No Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were generally enthusiastic about the impact of the SGOG process in their communities, with 43.8% of respondents saying that it had a great impact and 31.2% saying that the impact was somewhat positive. One respondent felt that there was negative impact and three were unsure of the impact.
Table 3: Perceived impact of SGOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great!</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat positive impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/No Answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were overwhelmingly positive about the SGOG project, with 81.2% saying that they would recommend this process to other communities. While two respondents would only recommend the process with some modifications, one respondent said that he or she would not recommend the process at all.

Table 4: Recommending the SGOG process to other communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I would recommend SGOG to other communities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I would recommend SGOG to other communities, if there are some modifications made to the process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I would not recommend SGOG to other communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/No Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SGOG Process

All respondents at least agreed that the SGOG process had been inclusive of the public, but respondents were less certain about the degree to which the public was consulted and that all appropriate sectors were included. Three-quarters of respondents felt strongly that the charrette is an effective tool for including the public in planning and design. All respondents but one felt that the public had ownership over the SGOG process in their community and that outcomes are communicated to the public.
Table 5: Public involvement in the SGOG process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG process has been inclusive of the general public</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been sufficient public consultation in the SGOG process</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The charrette is an effective tool for encouraging public involvement in planning and design in the SGOG process</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All appropriate sectors have been adequately represented in the SGOG process</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public has a sense of ownership over the SGOG process in their communities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts and outcomes of the SGOG process are communicated to the public</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents said that the greatest degree of support for the SGOG process came from municipal staff, with 46% of respondents selecting a ranking of 5 for this stakeholder group, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being low. Respondents felt that they got the least amount of support from the development community and property owners, with 54% of respondents choosing a ranking of only 3.
Table 6: Support from stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Low - 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High - 5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal officials</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local developers and property owners</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in the community</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents considered the partnership between an academic institution, professional organization and non-governmental organization to have provided added benefit for this project, with over 80% of respondents strongly agreeing with this statement and only one respondent disagreeing. While 73% of respondents at least agreed that the discrete responsibilities of the different partners were clear, three respondents did not feel that this was the case. Again, approximately half of the respondents felt that partners provided the necessary guidance to the advisory committee, but three respondents disagreed. Most respondents felt that the advisory committee had good representation from all of the relevant sectors, but four respondents felt that this area could have been stronger. Almost half (40%) of respondents felt that the advisory committee does not meet frequently enough and that the committee did not provide sufficient guidance to the project managers in the three communities (43%). Some respondents were concerned that there was not an effective mechanism in place for project managers to report back to the committee. Similarly, 40% of respondents did not feel that there was a mechanism for the advisory committee to report back to the project partners.
Table 7: Roles of project partners and advisory committee members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The partnership between an academic institution, professional organization and non-governmental organization has provided added benefit for this project</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The discrete responsibilities of each project partner are clear</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project partners have provided sufficient guidance and advice on all aspects to the SGOG advisory committee</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG advisory committee has sufficient representations from all relevant sectors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG advisory committee meets often enough</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG advisory committee provides advice and counsel to the project managers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at advisory committee meetings has been strong</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an appropriate system in place for the project managers to report back to the SGOG advisory committee</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an appropriate system in place for the SGOG advisory committee to report back to project partners</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority (54%) of respondents felt that the 10 steps for implementing SGOG were employed in the pilot communities, with only one person disagreeing. While 43% of respondents felt that there was sufficient funding for implementing the project, three respondents did not feel that this was the case. However, 64% of respondents did indicate that the budget was managed efficiently and effectively. All respondents
thought that the project was administered in a timely manner, except two respondents who said they were unsure. No respondents felt that there was poor attendance at the charrettes. Respondents were mostly unsure (54%) about how conflicts were managed during the implementation of the project.

Table 8: Execution of the SGOG process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 10 phases of implementing the SGOG process were followed in the three communities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been sufficient funding available to fully implement the SGOG process in the three communities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG budget has been managed in an efficient and effective manner</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG process has been executed in a timely manner</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at community planning meetings and charrettes has been strong</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are mechanisms in place to resolve conflicts that might arise during the implementation process</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SGOG Outcomes in the Three Pilot Communities

Respondents felt that the SGOG process had its greatest impact in terms of public awareness and acceptance of sustainable planning design and construction among charrette respondents. Respondents were least convinced of the impact of SGOG on financers.
Table 9: Creation of public awareness and acceptance of sustainable planning design and construction among stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal officials</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal staff</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the charrette team</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local developers and property owners</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in the community</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financiers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents (54%) thought that development in the three communities now incorporates comprehensive smart growth and sustainability principles, but two respondents did disagree and four were unsure. Even if the principles are not yet being incorporated, 92% of respondents felt that the SGOG process has created wider awareness and acceptance of sustainable community planning design and construction in the real estate and development industry, with only one respondent being unsure on this matter.
Table 10: Impacts of SGOG on the real estate and development industry in the three communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development in the three communities now incorporates comprehensive</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart growth and sustainability principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG process has created wider awareness and acceptance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of sustainable community planning design and construction in the real</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estate and development industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents felt that some of the eight smart growth principles were incorporated into the pilot communities’ planning processes more than others. For instance, almost half (45%) of respondents provided a mid-range ranking of three for ‘good jobs can be found close to home’, indicating that they did not feel that this principle was overly well incorporated into the communities’ development planning and policies. On the other hand, respondents felt that the principle ‘work in harmony with natural systems’ and ‘infrastructure and buildings are smarter, greener, and cheaper’ were well incorporated, with 36% and 27% of respondents respectively selecting a ranking of 5.

Table 11: Incorporation of the SGOG principles into planning in the three pilot communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Low -1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High -5</th>
<th>N/ A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each community is complete</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options to the car are emphasized</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in harmony with natural systems</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While 63% of respondents felt that attitudes and processes around land development have begun to change in the three communities, slightly fewer respondents (54%) agree that there is an increased acceptance of an open, participatory, and integrated design process that supports smart growth and sustainability principles in the three communities. In fact, 45% of respondents were unsure if the SGOG process has increased acceptance of open and inclusive sustainable planning processes and 64% of respondents were unsure if there has been a diversion of development investment away from conventional development toward smart growth and sustainable development in the three communities.
Table 12: Shifting the land development process in the three pilot communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes and processes around land development have begun to change in the three communities</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is an increased acceptance of an open, participatory, and integrated design process that supports smart growth and sustainability principles in the three communities</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There has been a diversion of development investment away from conventional development toward smart growth and sustainable development in the three communities</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were generally confident that SGOG process has been successful at advancing smart growth and sustainability principles and practice. All but two respondents felt that the research from SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to sustainability and all but one felt that SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to public participation. Respondents were less certain that SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to implementation of smart growth, with 15% of respondents disagreeing with this statement and another 15% being unsure whether this was the case.
Table 13: Advancing smart growth and sustainability principles and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research from SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to sustainability</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This extensive research and design innovations of SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to public participation</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extensive research and design innovation of SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to the implementation of smart growth</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the Concept Plans, all but one respondent, who was unsure, felt that the plans adequately incorporate the eight SGOG principles, but respondents were less convinced that these plans would form the basis for implementing SGOG, with two respondents disagreeing with the statement that the Concept Plans would for the basis for implementation and one respondent being unsure.

Table 14: Creating a range of innovative local concept plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG concept plans adequately incorporate the eight principles</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG concept plans form the basis of implementation for SGOG in the three communities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents showed that they have not seen the results of the SGOG process and Concept Plans being implemented in the three pilot communities in that many respondents disagreed (17%) or were unsure (25%) around the fact that the communities have yet to present some tangible evidence and case studies of the costs and benefits of smarter, more sustainable communities. However, 71% of respondents did indicate that they at least agreed that a variety of tangible products, ranging from computer presentations to books have been created to disseminate the goals, activities and results of the SGOG project.

Table 15: Creating educational and marketing products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The communities now have some tangible evidence and case studies of the costs and benefits of smarter, more sustainable communities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A variety of tangible products, ranging from computer presentations to books have been created to disseminate the goals, activities and results of the SGOG project</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents mostly all agreed that the SGOG process had at least some impact in terms of increasing awareness and advocacy of smart growth and sustainability among all stakeholders, with only one respondent disagreeing that this is the case for civil servants and the development community. Respondents felt that the most significant impact was with members of the charrette team, with 55% strongly agreeing that SGOG has created an increased awareness and desire to advocate for smart growth and sustainability for this group of stakeholders.
Table 16: Creating an increase in awareness and advocacy of smart growth and sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the charrette team</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil servants</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development community</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long-Term Outcomes of SGOG

Respondents were fairly certain that a number of SGOG’s potential long-term impacts will be realized. Respondents were particularly confident, with 38% of respondents selecting a high ranking of 5, that the SGOG process will be able to create neighbourhoods with more efficient land use and reductions in the vehicle use. Approximately one third of respondents also selected rankings of 5, showing that they are optimistic that the long-term impacts such as citizens and community organizations in BC will be provided with better options and more choices for livable communities and that they will be increasingly engaged in planning processes, professional engineers, architects, developers, landscape architects, and government regulators will gain a better understanding of smart growth practices, sustainability will be integrated into land use planning and policies, and elected officials will be able to communicate sustainability goals to their constituents, will all be achieved.
### Table 17: Long-term impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Low -1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High - 5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create affordable, diverse, and inclusive housing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect water sources</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhoods with more efficient land use</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhoods that lessen transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create reductions in vehicle kilometers traveled per capita</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create reductions in infrastructure costs per dwelling unit</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create reductions in average home costs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to financial investments in ‘green’ and sustainable buildings</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens and community organizations in BC will be educated about the benefits of sustainable and smart growth development</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens and community organizations in BC will be increasingly and effectively engaged throughout the local land development processes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional engineers, architects, developers, landscape architects, and government regulators will gain awareness, knowledge, tools, case studies, and precedents for increased incorporation of sustainability imperatives into their everyday practice</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact | Low -1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | High - 5 | N/A
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Policy makers, planners, engineers, and design professionals in local and regional government will gain new insight into land use regulation and urban design policies | 0% | 25% | 0% | 42% | 33% | 0%
Elected officials will acquire an effective communication tool for interacting with constituents about smart growth and sustainability | 8% | 8% | 15% | 23% | 31% | 15%
The real estate and development community will obtain a broader menu of options for designing more sustainable communities | 15% | 8% | 31% | 23% | 23% | 0%

Summary of the SGOG Project Management Team Members Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Preliminary Questions

The majority of respondents were from Maple Ridge, with only 25% of the respondents coming from Squamish; however, the project management team was larger in Maple Ridge than in Squamish. There were no respondents from Oliver, as there was no project management team there.

Table 18: Community association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Squamish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents identified themselves as advisory committee members or municipal staff. It is possible that respondents mixed up terminology
and really meant project management team and not advisory committee. One respondent was an elected municipal official.

Table 19: Role in SGOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory committee member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While over one third of respondents described the impact of SGOG in their community as great (37.5%), most respondents (62.5%) said that the process had a somewhat positive impact in their community. No respondents felt that there was no impact or a negative impact as a result of the SGOG process.

Table 20: Perceived impact of SGOG in the three pilot communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat positive impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/No Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents would recommend the SGOG process to other communities, but 50% of those who responded would only recommend the process if there were some modifications made to the process.
Table 21: Recommending the SGOG process to other communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I would recommend SGOG to other communities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I would recommend SGOG to other communities, if there are some modifications made to the process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I would not recommend SGOG to other communities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/No Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SGOG Process**

Respondents felt generally that the SGOG process was inclusive of the public. All respondents at least agreed that the process was inclusive of the public, with 43% strongly agreeing that the process was inclusive. Respondents also felt that there was sufficient public consultation, with 43% both agreeing and strongly agreeing; however, one respondent did disagree that there was sufficient public consultation in the SGOG process. Again, all respondents agreed that the charrette is an effective tool for encouraging public involvement in planning and design in the SGOG process. On the other hand, almost half of the respondents (43%) felt that all relevant sectors were not adequately represented in the SGOG process, although 58% did feel that all relevant sectors were represented. Most respondents felt that the public in fact had a sense of ownership over the SGOG process in their communities, but one third of the respondents did not feel that this was the case. Respondents were split on the issue of how well outcomes were communicated to the public. While 14% strongly agreed that outcomes were communicated and 43% also agreed, the remaining 43% disagreed that the outcomes were communicated to the public.
Table 22: Public involvement in the SGOG process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG process has been inclusive of the general public</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been sufficient public consultation in the SGOG process</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The charrette is an effective tool for encouraging public involvement in planning and design in the SGOG process</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All appropriate sectors have been adequately represented in the SGOG process</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public has a sense of ownership over the SGOG process in their communities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts and outcomes of the SGOG process are communicated to the public</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were split on the degree of support for the SGOG process demonstrated by municipal officials. While one respondent felt that the municipal officials provided a high degree of support, the rankings 2, 3, and 4, on a scale of 1 to 5, with one being low, were each selected by two respondents. Respondents felt more strongly that there was a high degree of support from municipal staff, with 57% choosing a ranking of 5. Over half of the respondents felt that there was a decent amount of support from local developers and property owners. They were less positive about the support from community organizations though, with over half of the respondents selecting a ranking of 3 or under and no respondents selecting 5. Respondents said that there was a moderate degree of support from individuals in the community, with 57% of respondents selecting a ranking of 3.
Table 23: Support from stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Low - 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High - 5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal officials</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local developers and property owners</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in the community</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All but one respondent felt that the 10 phases for implementing the SGOG process were followed in their communities. However, 71% of respondents felt that there was insufficient funding to fully implement the SGOG process in their communities. Respondents were split in their answers regarding how efficiently and effectively the budgets were managed, with 57% agreeing that the budgets were well managed and 43% disagreeing. Only two respondents felt that the SGOG process was not implemented in a timely manner and that the attendance at the charrettes could have been stronger. There seemed to be a divergence in opinions around the mechanisms for addressing conflicts in the implementation process, with 43% saying that there are mechanisms in place, but 14% disagreeing and an additional 14% strongly disagreeing. Another 29% of respondents felt unable to respond to that statement, perhaps because they were not part of any conflicts that needed to be resolved.
Table 24: Execution of the SGOG process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 10 phases of implementing the SGOG process were followed in my community</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been sufficient funding available to fully implement the SGOG process in my community</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG budget has been managed in an efficient and effective manner in my community</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG process has been executed in a timely manner in my community</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at community planning meetings and charrettes has been strong in my community</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are mechanisms in place to resolve conflicts that might arise during the implementation process in my community</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents found most of the eight smart growth principles to be highly appropriate for their communities, with the exception of ‘each community is complete’ and ‘good jobs can be found close to home’. Respondents indicated that these two principles were less appropriate for their communities. The vast majority of respondents felt that the principle around honouring the spirit of each community was an especially important goal for their community. Two respondents also felt that ‘housing meets the needs of the whole community’ was not overly appropriate for their community.
Table 25: Appropriateness of the SGOG principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Low -1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High -5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each community is complete</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options to the car are emphasized</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in harmony with natural systems</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and buildings are smarter, greener, and cheaper</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing meets the needs of the whole community</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good jobs can be found close to home</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The spirit of each community is honoured</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone has a voice</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to other typical planning or development processes usually employed, all but one respondent felt that the SGOG process has been better at leading to change in the sustainability and development in their communities. The remaining respondent felt that the SGOG process was equally as good as existing community processes. Almost half the respondents felt that the SGOG process was also better at engaging the members of the public in the development and planning process than existing methods, but two respondents felt that the SGOG process was no better than methods already used in their community. Respondents particularly felt that the SGOG process was much better at educating the public about smart growth and sustainability (57%) than their existing processes. Most respondents felt that the SGOG process was better at creating research on topics important to local sustainability, but one respondent felt that the SGOG process was not as strong in this area as existing community research. Most respondents (57%) felt that the SGOG process was better at coming up with innovative land use and design solutions, but 71% of respondents said that the SGOG process was not better than existing processes in terms of following through to make plans into a reality.
Table 26: SGOG compared to existing planning processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Much Worse</th>
<th>N/ A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading to change in the sustainability of development in my community</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating the public about smart growth and sustainability</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging the members of the public in the development and planning processes</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating research on topics important to local sustainability</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming up with innovative land use and design solutions</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following through to make plans into reality</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SGOG Outcomes**

Respondents felt most strongly that the SGOG process has created wider public awareness and acceptance of sustainable planning design and construction among the members of the charrette team, with 50% strongly agreeing that this group of stakeholders has increased awareness and acceptance. Although one person disagreed, 87% of respondents indicated that they perceived an increased awareness and acceptance of the smart growth principles among municipal officials. All respondents at least agreed that the process has created increased awareness and acceptance among municipal staff. Respondents were less optimistic about the SGOG process’ impact on local developers and property owners, community organizations, and individuals in the general community. Half of the respondents felt that the process had no impact on financiers.
Table 27: Creation of public awareness and acceptance of sustainable planning design and construction among stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal officials</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal staff</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the charrette team</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local developers and property owners</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in the community</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financiers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the real estate and development industry in the pilot communities, 50% of respondents agreed that development in their communities now incorporates comprehensive smart growth and sustainability principles and that there is a greater awareness of sustainable community planning and design and construction in these industries. However, three respondents disagreed with both of these statements.

Table 28: Impacts of SGOG on the real estate and development industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development in my community now incorporates comprehensive smart growth and sustainability principles</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG process has created wider awareness and acceptance of sustainable community planning design and construction in the real estate and development industry</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents felt that some of the eight smart growth principles had been incorporated into their local planning processes more than others. Most respondents felt that both ‘housing meets the needs of the whole community’ and ‘good jobs can be found close to home’ were not well incorporated into planning and development in their communities, with 25% of respondents selecting a ranking of 1 for each of these statements. Reflecting that respondents generally did not feel that most of the principles have been well incorporated into local planning and development, most respondents selected rankings of 3 or less for all of the principles, with the exception of ‘infrastructure and buildings are smarter, greener, and cheaper’ where 50% of the respondents selected a high ranking of 4.

Table 29: Incorporation of the SGOG principles into planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Low -1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High - 5</th>
<th>N/ A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each community is complete</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options to the car are emphasized</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in harmony with natural systems</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and buildings are smarter, greener, and cheaper</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing meets the needs of the whole community</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good jobs can be found close to home</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The spirit of each community is honoured</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone has a voice</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one respondent disagreed that attitudes and processes around land development have begun to change and two disagreed that there is an increased acceptance of an open, participatory, and integrated design process that supports smart growth and sustainability principles. However, 62% of respondents disagreed that there has been a diversion of development investment away from conventional development toward
smart growth and sustainable development (although one person did strongly agree with this statement).

Table 30: Shifting the land development process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and processes around land development have begun to change in my community</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an increased acceptance of an open, participatory, and integrated design process that supports smart growth and sustainability principles in my community</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been a diversion of development investment away from conventional development toward smart growth and sustainable development in my community</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents felt that the research from SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with the respect to sustainability, with 29% strongly agreeing and 71% agreeing. While most respondents at least agreed that the extensive research and design innovation of SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to public participation and in terms of implementation of smart growth, two respondents disagree with each of these statements.
Table 31: Advancing smart growth and sustainability principles and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research from SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to sustainability</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extensive research and design innovations of SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to public participation</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extensive research and design innovation of SGOG has advanced the current state of knowledge and best practices with respect to the implementation of smart growth</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the Concept Plans, 87% of respondents at least agreed that the Concept Plan for their community adequately incorporates the eight smart growth principles and that these plans form the bases for implementing SGOG in their communities. However, one respondent disagreed with each of these statements.
Table 32: Creating a range of innovative local concept plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG concept plan in my community adequately incorporates the eight principles</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGOG concept plan for my community forms the basis of implementation for SGOG in the three communities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While half of the respondents disagreed that their communities now have some tangible evidence and case studies of the costs and benefits of smarter, more sustainable communities, 50% of respondents agreed that the SGOG process has created a variety of tangible products, ranging from computer presentations to books, have been created to disseminate the goals, activities and results of the SGOG project.

Table 33: Educational and marketing products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My community now has some tangible evidence and case studies of the costs and benefits of smarter, more sustainable communities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A variety of tangible products, ranging from computer presentations to books, have been created to disseminate the goals, activities and results of the SGOG project</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents felt that SGOG has had a great impact in terms of creating awareness around smart growth and sustainability among citizens in the pilot communities, with 88% of agreeing that SGOG has created an increased awareness and advocacy of smart growth and sustainability.
among citizens. Respondents felt that charrette respondents in particular have developed an increased awareness, with three respondents strongly agreeing that members of the charrette team have an increased awareness as a result of SGOG. Respondents also felt that SGOG has created increased awareness among civil servants, with 38% strongly agreeing and 62% agreeing. Respondents perceived a lesser impact on community organizations, with 62% saying that SGOG has created an increased awareness for this group and 25% saying it has not created an increased awareness among community organizations. Respondents felt that SGOG made little headway with the development community, with 50% of respondents disagreeing that SGOG has influenced this group’s level of awareness, which seems to contradict earlier statements that the development community has begin to adopt smart growth and sustainability principles into their work.

Table 34: Creating an increase in awareness and advocacy of smart growth and sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the charrette team</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil servants</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development community</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long-Term Outcomes of SGOG

In terms of long-term outcomes, respondents were fairly confident that the SGOG process will lead to a creation of more affordable, diverse, and inclusive housing, with 57% selecting a ranking of 4. On the other hand, respondents were not has certain that the SGOG process would create reductions in infrastructure costs per dwelling or in the average home costs, with most respondents selecting rankings of 3 or less in these areas. Respondents were less clear on the connection between the SGOG process and protection of water sources, with 71% giving only a ranking of 3 to this potential outcome of the process. Respondents saw
the strongest impact of the SGOG process happening in the area of creating neighbourhoods with more efficient land use, with all respondents selecting a ranking of 3 or higher and two of those respondents selecting a ranking of 5. Although respondents felt that the SGOG process could lead to reductions in transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions, with 43% selecting a ranking of 4, 86% of respondents selected a ranking of 3 or under for SGOG’s ability to create reductions in the use of vehicles. Even though respondents stated earlier in the survey that they did not feel that SGOG had a great deal of impact on financiers, when it comes to long-term impacts of the project, all respondents selected a ranking of 3 or above for the process leading to financial investments in green and sustainable buildings. Respondents were fairly optimistic that citizens and community organizations in BC will be provided with better options and more choices for livable communities and these groups will be educated about the benefits of sustainable and smart growth development, as well as be increasingly engaged throughout the local land development processes. As for professional engineers, architects, developers, landscape architects, and government regulators, respondents felt that these groups too will gain an awareness, knowledge, and tools for incorporating sustainability into their work as a result of SGOG. Although respondents said earlier in the questionnaire that there has yet to be a great degree of implementation of smart growth principles into planning and policies, they did indicate that over time, this will likely occur and that elected officials will also acquire tools for communicating the need for sustainability to their constituents. Respondents did show some hesitation around the ability of SGOG to ensure that the real estate and development community will obtain a broader menu of options for sustainable design, with 43% selecting a low ranking of 2.

Table 35: Long-term impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Low -1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High -5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create affordable, diverse, and inclusive housing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect water sources</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhoods with more efficient land use</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhoods that lessen transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create reductions in vehicle kilometers traveled per capita</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create reductions in infrastructure costs per dwelling unit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create reductions in average home costs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to financial investments in ‘green’ and sustainable buildings</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens and community organizations in BC will be provided with better options and more choices for livable communities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens and community organizations in BC will be educated about the benefits of sustainable and smart growth development</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens and community organizations in BC will be increasingly and effectively engaged throughout the local land development processes</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional engineers, architects, developers, landscape architects, and government regulators will gain awareness, knowledge, tools, case studies, and precedents for increased incorporation of sustainability imperatives into their everyday practice</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low -1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High - 5</th>
<th>N/ A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers, planners, engineers, and design professionals in local and regional government will gain new insight into land use regulation and urban design policies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials will acquire an effective communication tool for interacting with constituents about smart growth and sustainability</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The real estate and development community will obtain a broader menu of options for designing more sustainable communities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E:
KEY INFORMATANT INTERVIEWS SUMMARY

The SGOG Partnership

Sense of Value-Added

To the question, ‘What do you see as the value added of the SGOG partnership?’ many stated simply that SGOG would not exist in its present form were it not for the current partnership. One said the partners provide the necessary balance between a major player in the development industry (REIBC), a public advocate (SGBC), and the professional expertise of the university-based centre (DCS) for an undertaking of this kind. Another recognized the value of learning about what makes their different partners tick, noting, for example, that academic planners and real estate professionals are rarely well informed about each other. This increases the number of perspectives that can be brought to bear on any given issue. Yet another benefit of the partnership was the fact that the initiative as a whole and the individual partners now reach the organizations’ three very different audiences. In a way, it sets the stage for more partnership building.

Several identified REIBC’s ability to bring a measure of reality to the table in the form of its market and economic analyses, and one pointed out the public’s appreciation of this ability. Several stated, too, that REIBC is able to reach into BC’s development community on a public relations basis, although it was also indicated that the institute has barely tapped into its sizable provincial network. It has only begun to contribute its value in this respect.

SGBC’s ability to organize and run a successful collaborative planning process in the communities was regarded as a valuable asset by several interviewees. The same was said of the considerable design skills the UBC people possess and of their ability to grapple with difficult and often technical sustainable development issues.

Division of Labour

It was generally recognized that the demands of SGOG have not been evenly distributed amongst the three partners. The Design Centre for
Sustainability was seen as carrying the heaviest work load (especially at the beginning), in terms of staff time, and that this was likely to continue unless things were changed. One interviewee stated that because DCS now has many other projects going on, the load is too heavy and needs to be scaled back. Another saw that DCS felt it was giving a lot to SGOG but, because of the initiative’s name, it was not being recognized for its efforts. Candidate areas for lightening the load at DCS were seen to be background work and research.

One respondent stated that with the completion of the first three case study communities, the SGOG process can now be commoditized and delivered to a broader range of communities without requiring as much from DCS staff. It was suggested that three or four templates be created that capture the needs of different types of BC communities (e.g. one for a resort community, one for a community on the urban/rural fringe). Lots of BC’s smaller communities do not have a planner and this is where the SGOG templates could be slotted in.

It was also evident to many of the interviewees that REIBC has played a minor role so far, compared to the other two organizations. One interviewee, who described that role as advisory, stated that REIBC had handled the partners’ expectations for its contributions well. Another explained that staff turnover at REIBC has slowed down the integration of this partner with the others somewhat.

**Fundraising**

Opinions of SGOG’s fundraising efforts to-date were mixed (the comments ‘they do a great job’, ‘quite successful’ and ‘not a very good job so far’ were all recorded, for example). It has been ‘spectacular’ sometimes and ‘frustrating’ at others, one person said. Even so, most believed that fundraising was probably not SGOG’s strong suit, that funding needs constant attention, and further, that the days of easy fundraising – for pilot projects – were over. Still, it was generally acknowledged that the necessary amount of funding for the first three case-study communities had been successfully secured. And one respondent reported witnessing the SGOG staff present itself very well in Ottawa on one fundraising occasion.

Most respondents felt that SGOG could probably be doing more to raise funds. Considerable efforts at the provincial level have met with only small success, apparently. It was noted that REIBC was not involved in
fundraising efforts outside of those to the Real Estate Foundation for its market and economic analyses. Some of these funds are apparently still available. One respondent noted that the DCS has not followed up on its funding arrangements very quickly; nor has it sought out funding very actively. This is because they do not put a lot of staff time into it, the respondent explained.

One respondent offered that the nature of the SGOG process makes fundraising difficult. For one thing, it is a costly process and funders do not always see the value in it. For another thing, the divisions between the three organizations can appear muddy to potential funders. And for another thing still, now that the pilot-project phase is over, funders (the federal government in particular) are expected to be reluctant to finance something that is not new. This will mean finding new twists on the initiative, one interviewee suggested.

As for fundraising in the post-pilot project phase, one respondent felt that a re-branding of SGOG would be helpful, even key to success in this area. The next round of fundraising, this individual suggested, has to involve a plan to succeed throughout the province. It should also involve writing all three organizations into the funding proposals, another suggested. The need for careful communication among the partners vis-à-vis funding was emphasized by one person. The idea of going to municipalities for funding was floated. And the point was made that funding sources need to feel as though they are being kept ‘in the loop’ throughout the project.

**Changes, Shortcomings and Corrective Measures**

Not too much has changed at SGOG in terms of the relationships between the major partners in the first three-year period, according to many of those interviewed. Some early overlaps in responsibilities have been sorted out. There have been changes amongst the REIBC staff responsible for SGOG, on two occasions, but otherwise the same people are still involved. It was suggested that the staff turnover at REIBC is one reason the Institute's relatively minor role in SGOG has not changed. In contrast, the ties between SGBC and DCS have strengthened over time. A substantial change that has happened over the three-year period is that DCS has come to be responsible for many other projects besides SGOG.

When asked about weaknesses in the SGOG partnership and corrective measures necessary at this time, one respondent stated that everything
was fine. The others, however, raised six topics of concern. The most frequently mentioned weakness related to the name ‘Smart Growth on the Ground’ and for all these people re-branding was seen as the corrective measure to take. The other weaknesses identified (in order of importance) had to do with funding, networking with the development community, and overlap of responsibilities amongst the partners. The geographical scope of the case studies, which is unrelated to the SCOG partnership per se, was also raised as an issue to be addressed.

Several respondents identified a problem with the name of the initiative, ‘Smart Growth on the Ground’, suggesting that its likeness to ‘Smart Growth BC’ was causing confusion on the part of the public. More specifically, it was pointed out that the SGOG-related work that DCS carries out is rendered invisible with this name. The confused identity is a language problem, one person explained – a new name is necessary. Concern was simultaneously expressed that a name change and re-branding may de-link the initiative from its historical track record – the work it has done.

Fundraising issues, although discussed earlier in the interview, were raised a second time when respondents identified the topic as a definite weakness of SGOG. Points that were not raised earlier (and discussed above) include the fragmentation of the fundraising efforts to-date, in which the three organizations seek funding according to the part they play in SGOG, needs to be replaced with a more unified approach. It was suggested that each organization write the others into its funding requests. Lastly, it was felt that the partners have not tapped into their funding links sufficiently.

Another weakness identified in the SGOG partnership involves networking with the development industry. Several respondents expressed the opinion that REIBC has not been doing enough to engage and educate developers about smart growth and sustainable development and planning in SGOG’s partner communities. One noted that a workshop REIBC planned for Maple Ridge was never held. Another commented that the Institute has only begun to contribute its value to SGOG in the area of networking with the development community. The person stated that REIBC definitely has the ability to do this because of its sizable network in the province.

An emerging weakness, according to one respondent, is the overlap amongst the partners’ responsibilities. In particular, the distinction
between the responsibilities of DCS and SGBC when it comes to community involvement is getting fuzzy. While this is something SGBC is supposed to take the lead on, it clearly needs input from DCS. For some reason, however, DCS has led a lot of the public involvement work recently. Another individual, however, stated that SGOG was now doing a better job of clarifying the roles of partners and key individuals than before.

Finally, one interviewee suggested that DCS suffered from its connection with SGBC at one point – when the release of SGBC’s Sprawl Report, which rated Maple Ridge very poorly, coincided with the UBC team’s meetings in that community.

**Executive Committee**

All of the interviewees were either currently members of the executive committee (EC) or had been in the past. Most believed the committee was run effectively and the number of meetings was about right, but that there was nevertheless room for improvement. One person stated that it was a responsive committee (it made necessary changes to SGOG as the initiative evolved); another, that the chair was fully engaged with the committee. A more defined structure for the meetings would be beneficial, one person suggested, but only if the efficient informality of the present arrangement is maintained.

It was suggested that the EC could benefit from a clearer sense of its own role vis-à-vis the partners’ organizations, and in particular from distinctions between the types of decisions made by day-to-day operational staff, the executive committee, and the advisory committee. One person stated that the EC seems to have focused on trouble-shooting to-date. There was a call from some for more meetings, a regular meeting time, regular attendance, and a greater role in the EC on the part of REIBC.

**Advisory Committee**

While a few of the interviewees were or had been members of the advisory committee (AC), the impression shared by all was that its role had declined in importance and that a better way to use the committee needed to be found. The committee was variously described as too large, without purpose, meeting too infrequently, lacking an effective chair, and in need of more appropriate members. The committee was
reportedly used to good advantage early on, when its members’ guidance was sought on community-selection criteria, for example. For many, its present purpose is unclear.

When asked how the committee could be better utilized, the following suggestions were offered: a smaller and more focused membership; regular meetings; established topics on which the AC will always consult, e.g., funding, partner community selection, key topics for public education; and the use of surveys on these and other topics in lieu of meetings. One person suggested the committee assume the role of funding sponsorship. Another said the committee is capable of more substantive decision-making than it has carried out to-date – like a guidance committee.

The Community Partnerships

Bringing New Municipal Councils on Board

The question – ‘How does SGOG plan on bringing new councils on board in terms of adopting and implementing the communities’ concept plans?’ – elicited two types of responses. The first acknowledged that there really is not a process in place to do this, nor is there a budget for it. This is because, as initially set up, SGOG intended to get the development going and then leave the case study community. Interviewees explained that things are turned over to the planning departments and some of the more committed local politicians, and the formalized documents (e.g., the concept plan) provide the continuity.

The second type of response to this question recognized the change of Councils following municipal elections as a problem for the implementation of SGOG’s Concept Plans. Suggestions for ‘bringing new councils on board’ included: holding workshops, presentations or other events with the new councils, in order to give SGOG a chance to go back and up-date the council and the community; encourage municipal staff to do this; and arrange for REIBC ‘volunteers’ to follow-up with council members.

Project Management Committees

The question relating to project management committees in the three case study communities asked interviewees to consider the strengths and
weaknesses of SGOG’s relationship to these committees in terms of supporting the implementation of the concept plans. Two interviewees offered no comment. Others more or less repeated the explanation provided for the previous question. That is, SGOG assumes a fundamental institutional shift will take place in each community such that the municipality and local groups will carry things through the implementation phase. The project management committees have not had anything to do with implementation to-date.

One respondent recognized that implementation of the concept plans has been disappointing so far, and suggested that it would be great to keep Jodie Siu on at 10% in each community, for example, but acknowledged that this would be expensive. It was noted that Squamish has had more work done since its year-long funding expired because the community hired SGBC to conduct more work on the sub-area plans.

The Forums, Workshops and Charrettes

Public Turnout, Engagement and Representation

The public turnout for the opening forums and educational workshops in the three communities was believed to be good and in need of no improvement by almost all respondents. One person noted that the same or similar numbers for each of the three communities made it clear that, proportionately, Oliver’s public forum turnout was very good while the others could have been better.

Several people took the opportunity to describe what, in particular, they found to be the strengths of the forums and workshops they attended. The excitement and level of motivation in the communities, the exceptional level of expertise speakers brought to the events, and the range of issues raised were all mentioned. One person was struck by the inclusiveness of the forum, noting the fact that four or five transient people attending the Squamish event felt able to speak up and contribute to the community’s discussion.

The later events in Oliver were not as well attended as the other events SGOG mounted in the various communities, according to one respondent, who believed these dates conflicted with the local planting season. It was also suggested that SGOG should become more creative in terms of the nature of the events it holds, partly so that the opening events
become more interactive. A café-style event in which public interaction is encouraged was suggested to replace the unidirectional, slide-show format that leaves the public in the dark.

In response to the question, ‘Compared to the typical planning or development process, do you think the SGOG process is engaging members of the public much better, better, the same, worse, or much worse?’ four people responded ‘much better’, one responded ‘better’ and two declined to comment.

When asked to explain why they think the SGOG process is successful in this regard, one respondent said people really feel they have the opportunity to speak to issues and see something tangible come out of it. Another said it’s because there is nothing ‘on the page’ when the process begins (e.g., no proposal from a developer to consider and react to); rather, it is wide open for the community to make its own suggestions, create its own solutions. SGOG brings the principles and the design brief but the community does the rest. Another respondent still said it was the collaborative aspect that made it so much better than the typical process.

The real issue here, one respondent volunteered, is how best to expedite public consultation.

As for how representative of the communities the charrette teams have been, two respondents who did not participate in the charrettes offered no comment, one said ‘pretty good’, and another said ‘as representative as possible’. Another still said ‘these things can always be more representative’ especially with an unlimited amount of resources. It was suggested that representativeness of the charrette teams had improved from one case study community to the next. It was noted that the personalities of representatives make a difference to who contributes and what gets contributed to the discussions. Another said the current strategy of drawing from stakeholder groups in the communities was a good one.

One respondent offered that improving the representativeness of the charrette team would be easier if the geographical scale of the planning area was reduced. That way, all the representatives could come to the table and a manageable team size could still be maintained. (A team size of 30 was reported as too much, whereas one of 25 was ideal.)
The make-up of the charrette teams tends to be middle-aged, white and slightly skewed towards men, one person indicated – even though the case studies have been in multicultural communities. Recruiting members for the charrette teams from First Nations and ethnic groups remains a challenge for SGOG. In Oliver, no representatives from the Osoyoos Indian Band, or the Portuguese and Indo-Canadian communities participated in the charrette although invitations were extended to all groups. In partial explanation for this, one person offered that participants are largely self-selected from amongst the stakeholder groups. Also, if an ethnic group does not have a formalized organization in the community they are unlikely to be represented on the charrette. It was suggested that SGOG needs a mechanism to identify a more diverse set of candidates within the community and encourage them to participate.

**Effectiveness of the Educational Workshops**

Two questions concerned the educational workshops, asking respondents to identify their strengths, in the first case, and their weaknesses and challenges, in the second. One of the strengths several people identified had to do with the target-setting exercises. Comments were as follows: people feel they are contributing something tangible with the target setting; people choose their own targets; and people like having a task they can see will impact the results.

Two other strengths identified were the well-organized nature of the workshops and the broader awareness about sustainable development they brought to communities. It was also stated that very simple principles get people on the same page and provide a common language to pursue the discussion around sustainable development at the community level. Along the same lines, it was stated that the workshops provided a forum for public discussion, idea generation and priority setting.

Two respondents found no weaknesses in the way the educational workshops have been run. One, however, found there to be repetition between the opening forum and the educational workshops and questioned whether the latter was necessary in every community. Two others spoke of time pressures and the necessity to compress information, the implication being that negative consequences flow from this. But the sophistication of the public present makes a difference in
this regard someone said. Comments about weak facilitation skills are mentioned below.

Suggestions for improvements were made. There was a call for more upfront education regarding sustainable development, especially before the target-setting exercises, and alternative formats that might encourage more youth to participate.

**Design Brief and Other Resources**

Responses to the question about the design brief – ‘How satisfied were you that the design brief served its purpose in the charrette?’ – depended on whether the interviewee had attended a design charrette. For those who had not (three people), no comment was offered. For those who had, the design briefs left people ‘100% satisfied’, with the feeling they were ‘great’, and aware they had improved over time.

One respondent identified a problem with the clarity of the population, housing and commercial projections, stating that this was a matter of page layout. Another said they were always a challenge to put together, always changing, and always influenced, in their use, by the facilitators working the charrette. In general though, they need to be simpler and shorter, and the SGOG team needs to be more familiar with them going into charrette.

In response to a question about whether the necessary resources were available to the charrette team, respondents either declined to comment (three) or answered in the affirmative. ‘DCS does a great job of bringing resources together’, one respondent volunteered.

**Research**

Respondents were asked two questions regarding the research conducted in the SGOG process. The first – ‘Compared to the typical planning or development process, how do you think the SGOG process is at creating research on topics important to local sustainability?’ – elicited three ‘no comments’, one respondent stating ‘good’, one ‘quite good’ and two stating ‘very good’. People said it ‘boils down to custom research for each community’, primary research is sometimes carried out (e.g., mapping), and the local community determines the research topics. Context setting research is important to the local community, someone
stated. And someone else described the charrette-based work as ‘real-time research’ and declared it to be one of UBC’s ‘strengths’. The research bulletin that DCS prepares, in which academic research is applied to a real place, was praised. And SGOG’s strategy of hiring Colliers and Coriolis for market and economic analyses in the communities was commended.

In response to the second question – ‘Are there any changes you would make to the research process carried out during the charrette?’ – most said no. One person commented that the research ‘templates’ made in the first case study communities would be useful in ones to come. However, another suggested that the research process needed to become more focused (tackle fewer issues) and better managed so that outsider consultants can prepare the report without the assistance necessity for DCS staff.

Facilitation

When asked if they would make any changes to the facilitation strategies employed in the charrettes, respondents gave a variety of responses. Four had no comment. Others suggested that changes were always being made – the circumstances themselves forced change and improvement was sometimes necessary.

It was noted that some of the people serving as facilitators for SGOG are not professionally trained facilitators. Another felt that the event facilitators should be pushing the charrette team towards consensus more strongly. It was suggested that more municipal staff should be used as facilitators, and also that smaller, more focused charrette teams should be created, stating that 25 has proven to be the ideal number.

A question about conflict resolution in the charrettes elicited two ‘no comments’, a simple ‘yes’, and four observations about the process. One observation was that consensus is great but not always possible. Another was that an informal, collaborative process will always get a better result than when a vote is simply put to a group of people. A third was that while the SGOG team did not always agree professionally with the decisions taken in the charrette, they typically stepped back (rather than impose their views) to let the community take control and ultimate ownership of the plan. And finally, another commented that the legacy of the consensus in the charrette is the issue – finding ways to make it durable.
Objectives and Outcomes

Overall

All respondents answered a question about SGOG’s objectives - ‘Are the original objectives that SGOG set out for itself still relevant, in your opinion?’ - in the affirmative. However, the one respondent who chose to elaborate made several points that seemed to detract from a 'yes' answer. This individual noted, first of all, that the objectives were too ambitious time-wise; the process can not be undertaken at the pace of one community per year. Second, the work involved entails more staff time than DCS presently has available, so the current pace cannot be maintained. And third, a solution may lie in making the planning areas smaller such the charrette and research processes can be conducted more quickly.

Influencing the Culture of Development

One of SGOG’s objectives is ‘To influence the culture of development such that sustainable communities become the norm rather than the exception.’ Respondents were asked a string of questions about this objective, beginning with the evidence they saw to suggest SGOG was influencing the culture of development. One person commented that it was difficult to separate out SGOG’s influence from other factors, while another said it was evident that LEEDs had become acceptable to developers during SGOG’s first three years. Two respondents claimed that the shift in the culture of development has progressed farthest in Squamish, others that SGOG was ‘making in-roads’ and has had success in bring planning departments ‘on board’, and yet another that the whole sustainable development movement has picked up speed. The observation was made that generally, where the partner community staff has been supportive of sustainable development and planning, the developers have had to follow their lead.

Actual evidence that an influence has been exerted by SGOG vis-à-vis development culture included: how it is more common to have people talk about sustainable development in planning and development offices than before; the excitement about sustainable development amongst planners, especially in Squamish; the development proposals for residential units in downtown Maple Ridge; the partial shift from highway-oriented commercial development to the downtown area in Squamish;
the number of development applications coming in with sustainable development criteria; examples of developers introducing smart growth developments on their own (i.e., in Chilliwack); the changes to the regulatory system of planning in the partner communities; and the fact that other places are embarking on charrette-based planning processes (e.g., Chilliwack).

When asked to identify obstacles to the shift in development culture, respondents said there were a lot of obstacles, including: municipal standards in both engineering and planning; municipal Councils which are always enticed by tried-and-true development projects that can yield taxes to the community quickly (in contrast to the slower pace of different kinds of development); the perception in certain parts of the real estate industry that SGOG is just a feel-good initiative; the strong cultural orientation to the car; SGOG’s poor job to-date in reaching and engaging developers directly; and the lack of political will to consistently back sustainable development.

Respondents were also asked ‘how, if at all, [they] see them being overcome?’ Municipal standards in engineering and planning are particularly difficult to overcome, it was said, because it is hard for the consequences of changing the standards to be appreciated. There are also multi-faceted problems involved (like road safety, for example). One suggestion was to have more case studies demonstrating strong rates of return for developers working in this area, while another was to have more exposure for the developers who do this work. Another still was to have REIBC engage more developers more directly. Along the same lines, a need was recognized to have the development community, elected officials and key landowners drawn into the SGOG process more. This would be more easily accomplished, it was suggested, if smaller geographical areas were planned. This would make it easier to have developers included on the charrette team and be exposed to the educational workshops, etc.

Increasing Awareness of Sustainable Development

In order to educate the public about smart growth and sustainable development and planning, SGOG staff will be expected to keep in step if not ahead of things in their professional fields. In response to a question about the ‘processes in place to ensure that the SGOG project is current’ or up-to-date with respect to new developments in sustainable development and planning, most people identified all or some of the
following: professional development amongst SGOG staff, SGOG’s professional staff are active in their field, UBC research, work with municipal staff, and community involvement. One respondent noted that more sophisticated modeling techniques are being developed these days (targets are more and more precise) and that SGOG staff are keeping up with the new techniques. Another respondent noted that professional development amongst SGOG staff emphasized the acquisition of technical skills, and called for a more balanced approach in this regard.

A recent shift in the field of sustainable development and planning has been to assign more importance to ‘the social’ than was previously the case. Interviewees were asked whether they thought the SGOG process was in fact covering all three aspects of sustainable development – the environmental, social and economic aspects – and whether it was doing so in a balanced way.

Most people responded first by saying ‘yes’ and then acknowledging that the environmental and to a lesser extent the economic aspects had received greater attention than the social. For some, this is changing; at first the environment was heavily emphasized, while now the economic and social aspects formed a larger part of the case studies. An increasingly better job of the economic analyses had been done as SGOG moved from Maple Ridge to Oliver, one person said. Another believed that the social aspects were less approachable given the physical-design orientation of SGOG, and another still stated that SGOG was not meant to address social issues in a substantial way. A third stated that SGOG’s de-emphasis of the social aspects of sustainable development is being addressed by some new techniques. But part of the problem, the person explained, is that the scale of the Concept Plan makes the consideration of and solutions to social problems difficult. A fourth individual suggested that SGOG’s relative inattention to the social explains why the benefits of its public consultation process are not part of the initiative’s public identity.

**Implementing Sustainable Development**

Catching the public’s imagination with something new is important to the long-term success of a strategy or initiative. When asked to compare SGOG’s performance with that of traditional planning approaches in terms of ‘coming up with innovative land use and design solutions’, respondents generally stated that it was better or much better (two offered no
comment). Reasons given included the roundtable format that SGOG employs; the layering of information, the comprehensive approach, and the integrated way of thinking through everything involved in the charrette process; the encouragement given to people to think big and to think creatively; the collaboration involved; and the emphasis on practical ideas. Examples of innovative solutions developed in the charrettes were offered, including a green truck corridor and an eco-industrial network in Squamish.

Given the emphasis SGOG has placed on implementation from the outset, the question asking respondents to cite evidence that the process has made sustainable development actually happen ‘on the ground’ goes directly to the initiative’s success in its first three years. While one respondent had no comment, everyone else commented on the lengthiness of the process in Maple Ridge and Squamish, and that it was too soon to tell in Oliver. One person believed that some actual building had taken place in conformance with the adopted concept plan in Maple Ridge. Others stated that the implementation phase should be accelerated. Another expressed disappointment, stating that SGOG had wanted to see the shovels go in the ground in its case study communities but realized that it can not wait around for implementation to occur.

Several respondents identified signs that sustainable planning was underway and that sustainable development would be ‘on the ground’ in relatively short order. These included Councils’ adoption of the concept plans (Maple Ridge, Squamish and Oliver), changing by-laws (Maple Ridge and Squamish) and official community plans (Maple Ridge and Squamish) to conform to the Concept Plans and/or facilitate sustainable development, and more planning studies to elaborate the Concept Plans (Squamish).

Asked whether they thought any of these things might have happened without SGOG, four respondents answered ‘no’. One said ‘maybe’, stating that it would have come much more slowly and without the public’s involvement, and that Squamish would be the most likely candidate. Others said sustainable development project could have been thought of, but not acted upon, and certainly not as an ensemble.

Respondents were asked whether they thought ‘there had been enough follow-up with the communities to facilitate implementation and communicate SGOG outcomes’, to which one responded ‘no comment’ and another ‘I don’t know’. Two respondents said ‘no, not enough’ and
others offered ideas as to what more could be done. One pointed out that research work conducted in Squamish by SGBC was providing one avenue of continuity and follow-up.

One person pointed to higher levels of government, which need to step in, support and take some initiative in sustainable planning and development. The person added that the discussion around sustainable development nationally has been remarkably ineffective.

Follow-up needs to revolve around keeping the charrette team engaged, one respondent said. Staff support is also critical. Funding, while difficult to secure for the implementation phase, is needed (to help with development review and by-law changes).

SGOG needs to continue marketing the process throughout, including the implementation phase, one person stated – so that it does not come across as a one-off thing in a community. This person thought that after Concept Plan approval a PowerPoint presentation to the development community was in order. The real estate industry could then get a buzz going about sustainable development in the community. Perhaps a presentation to the same audience could happen annually, especially when developments have gone in and more are in-process as these could be shown and discussed.

Finally, it was suggested that SGOG’s funding proposals should include the outcomes of the three case studies so far.

Creating a Legacy of Participatory Planning

Members of the partner communities were thought to have at least potentially acquired a number of skills in the course of participating in the SGOG process. These included skills related to discussion and listening, collaboration and negotiation, decision-making and developing consensus, design skills (how to put ideas/visions to paper), design collaboration, public presentations, the teaching of what one knows to others, and generally, participation with diverse groups of people. Appreciation of the fact that multiple, legitimate points of view can be held by any group of people was a valuable lesson, someone pointed out.

Land-use planning skills, more generally, were mentioned, as was the education on the municipal planning process that was part and parcel of the process. A heightened awareness of the process will enable
participants to contribute more next time, one respondent said. The excitement created about community planning was also considered a valuable outcome. The charrette afforded a great experience for the youth involved, another person stated.

The legacy of the consensus made in the design charrette and formalized in the Concept Plan is the issue, one respondent offered – finding ways to make it durable should be the focus of attention.

**Building a Reputation**

Three questions focused on the media, with the first concerning the effectiveness of SGOG’s relationship with the media in its first three years. Responses ranged from ‘very good press and the appropriate amount’ to ‘not highly effective’ and ‘terrible in Maple Ridge’ (where the release of a SGBC study, *The Sprawl Report*, which rated the municipality very poorly coincided with SGOG meetings in the community). Other comments were that SGOG’s media relationship has been quite successful in the three case study communities but not elsewhere; it has been improving over time – ‘Oliver was definitely effective’ – but this effectiveness is not BC-wide yet; and the message may be too focused on the technical side of planning. Yet another comment was that because SGOG does not actively cultivate good media relations, it winds up with the coverage the media decides upon. It was also noted that small town media are both much easier to deal with and in need of material. Overall, respondents said that improvements could be made in media relations.

When asked whether SGOG’s case studies are earning a reputation, most definitely thought that it was (two did not know). The reputation was largely believed to be regional and provincial in scope, although some maintained it extended nationally and even internationally. One person felt that local and federal organizations are well aware of SGOG, but that the provincial ones are not. Within the field of sustainable planning and development, for example, audiences at Canadian and American conferences definitely hear about SGOG’s case studies. All levels of government are certainly looking at what SGOG is doing, one person said. Someone reported that UBC’s publications goals have been met and that SGOG’s small website is slowly receiving more visits over time. A Chinese delegation interested in sustainable planning and development apparently visited Squamish in the late fall. It was said that although the initiative has not received any awards to-date, it was nominated for a Fraser Basin
Council award. One person suggested that SGOG should pursue more of these awards.

The final question aimed at determining SGOG’s progress towards meeting its objective of building a reputation for itself asked respondents about the recognizability of the initiative’s ‘brand’. Several people thought that while SGOG did possess a brand, it was not sufficiently distinctive and that re-branding was necessary. On the other hand, one person said the current brand seemed to work in small communities and that if the case study communities continued to be small ones on the urban/rural fringe or farther out, a change may not be necessary. Another was certain the current brand is recognizable; another still said there may not be any advantages of changing the brand now.

Three respondents were convinced that re-branding was necessary. They argued that while the name is recognized, the public does not understand the full sweep of the SGOG initiative. One person maintained that SGOG does not have a sufficiently clear brand to grab the public’s imagination and provide an understanding that goes beyond the ‘green stuff’. His argument is that SGOG is not playing up the fact that it is changing the way planning is done in BC communities, in terms of public participation and ownership of the final concept plans. It was also suggested that a less academic sounding tagline or catchphrase is necessary, one that is more evocative of the whole enterprise. Also necessary is a communications strategy that translates the core ideas – the three non-profit organizations with cutting-edge expertise in sustainable development to help BC communities plan their futures – to the public.

Ways Forward

Major Obstacles

Respondents identified the following ‘major obstacles to SGOG’s success in the future’ (five respondents identified funding; other obstacles were identified by one or two people):

- **funding**: federal government departments want new projects (simply involving new communities is not enough apparently), so new ‘twists’ need to be developed in the initiative in order to secure funding. (One thought is to focus on energy, water, health, etc. in different communities; a worry with this, however, is that the integrity
of the overall SGOG ‘package’ – its comprehensive treatment of sustainable development – will fade from view.)

- **‘SGOG’**: sticking with the SGOG name is problematic; a redefinition or a re-branding of the initiative is required;

- **the cost**: it has to be made less expensive to go through the process in a community

- **municipal follow-through**: the shift in institutional structure takes time and Council changes can de-rail progress in this respect;

- **municipal regulatory structure**: new development downtown is abiding by sustainable development plans;

- **DCS’s role**: DCS has to be happier with its role within SGOG; also, DCS’s increasing involvement with other projects which is drawing staff time and energy away from SGOG;

- **REIBC’s staff turnover**: lack of continuity;

- **over-demand for SGOG’s services**: lots of communities will want to have a case study;

- **shortage of facilitators**: especially those with skills suitable for the charrette process; and

- **government policymaking**: especially at higher levels of government where policies are often contrary to sustainable development (e.g. twinning the Port Mann Bridge)

**Important Actions**

Asked to identify ‘the single most important thing that SGOG must/should do to ensure it is going forward in meeting its original objectives’, respondents had the following things to say (their statement are paraphrased below):

- Keep SGOG doing what it’s doing. This should entail tweaking it a bit, so the process is not so lengthy or large (perhaps by working on a single site rather than a whole neighbourhood).
• Make the SGOG process into one that is so valuable that it’s seen as indispensable to planning for the future in BC communities.

• Successful funding is going to be the key to SGOG’s success in the future. SGOG needs to communicate to the sources of funding the levels and nature of its success to-date. This evaluation is a good place to start that process.

• The evaluation that we’re doing is the single most important thing.

• The most important thing is to select communities where the municipal council and its staff are ‘super keen’ about working with the SGOG process. Identify ‘champions’ for SGOG in these communities. Perhaps interview particular individuals in the partner community selection process.

• A mindset in which ‘adaptability’ figures importantly is crucial – adaptability to changing funding environments, to the needs of different communities, and to what is currently important in the field of sustainable planning and development.

• Find and use the tangible evidence that the SGOG process is working. If you cannot prove this, you do not have anything.
APPENDIX F: LITERATURE SCAN SUMMARY

Overview

Smart Growth on the Ground (or SGOG) is an innovative, land-use planning project that tries to bring sustainable design, planning and development practices to communities throughout the province. Its focus is on implementing smart growth and sustainability principles – on getting ‘smart growth on the ground’. SGOG began in 2003, in a context of rapid urban development in BC, when no or very little regard was being given to ‘green’ development alternatives to sprawl. The initial project period was set at three years, during which time three case studies were to be undertaken, while a 10-year time horizon (with a total of 10 case studies) was planned throughout BC for the project as a whole.

As a collaborative partnership between the Design Centre for Sustainability at UBC, Smart Growth BC and the Real Estate Institute of BC, SGOG’s staff members – experts in the field of sustainable planning and development – go to communities that have agreed to partner with SGOG, and, over the course of several months, take their leaders, staff and local stakeholder representatives through a 10-step sustainable development planning process. The focus of this process is an intensive design charrette. This is an intensive design-oriented workshop lasting three or four days where brain-storming experts and community representatives come up with conceptual plans for (re)development areas that would normally take months if not longer to create.

Context

SGOG was initiated in 2003 at a time of rapid urban growth in the province. Here and elsewhere, land development practices were creating negative impacts on communities (including escalating housing prices, traffic congestion, air and water pollution, loss of agricultural land, habitat loss, and the development of impersonal, car-dependent communities).

SGOG’s founders recognized that while planning schools had been teaching the methods of sustainable planning and development during much of the 1990s (several important texts came out in the late 1980s and early 1990s), subdivision development practices had not changed. Municipal planners and the development industry were still creating the wasteful, automobile-dominant patterns of urban sprawl.
Patrick Condon, the James Taylor Chair of Landscape Architecture at UBC, who helped create what was first called the Sustainable Communities Program there, was one of those wanting to bridge the gap between theory and practice in sustainable planning and development. He had also been centrally involved in the sustainable development demonstration project in Surrey known as the East Clayton project. Despite this kind of work, however, the actual implementation of comprehensive sustainable community plans was not going ahead.

In March 2003, representatives of UBC's Sustainable Communities Program, Smart Growth BC (SGBC), and the Real Estate Institute of BC (REIBC) met to discuss an initiative they called ‘Smart Growth on the Ground’ and what they wanted it to achieve by the end of an initial 3-year funding cycle. The three organizations set out the nature of their partnership further in a June 2003 business plan and then formalized it, together with vision and mission statements, objectives, funding and administration guidelines, and detailed descriptions of the partners’ roles and other things in an August 8, 2003 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

The vision and mission statements below, together with the statements of SGOG’s overall approach and principles that follows, are all from the MOU.

**Vision**

SGOG’s vision is “to transform sustainable community design and construction in British Columbia from being the exception to representing the norm.”

**Mission**

SGOG’s mission is “to help citizens and their elected officials implement smarter, more sustainable communities”, new or retrofitted neighbourhoods over the next ten years. Each will house an average of ten thousand residents, and collectively will represent over ten billion dollars of investment redirected into more sustainable forms of development.”
Approach

SGOG’s approach is to “shift the land development process in BC in favour of smart growth and sustainability by putting our trust in people. Smart Growth on the Ground will use inclusive design processes, extensive public consultation and capacity building, and outreach to and input from the development community. A key focus will be on the use of design charrettes as a public engagement, stakeholder buy-in, and decision-support tool.”

Key Objectives

SGOG has had six objectives from the very outset, and these are:

- To influence the culture of development such that sustainable communities become the norm rather than the exception.
- To effect the implementation of developments that incorporate comprehensive smart growth and sustainability principles.
- To create wider public and industry awareness and acceptance of sustainable community planning, design and construction.
- To increase the participation and expertise of citizens and community organizations in local development processes.
- To provide tangible evidence and case studies of the costs and benefits of smarter, more sustainable communities.
- To develop national and international recognition for the efforts of SGOG, its partners, and BC.

Principles

SGOG incorporates eight principles in their work towards these objectives. It asks that the elected officials of each partnering community agree to them before embarking on the SGOG process, and solidifies their agreement in a formal memorandum of understanding. As stated in the August 3, 2003 MOU, these principles are:

- Each community is complete
- Options to cars are emphasized
- Work in harmony with natural systems.
- Buildings and infrastructure are smarter, greener and cheaper.
- Housing serves the needs of the whole community.
- Good jobs are close to home.
- The spirit of each community is protected.
Everyone has a voice.

The SGOG Partnership

In early 2003, SGOG's future partners discussed four thematic areas and assigned major responsibilities to what later became the three official partners, as follows: (1) community outreach was assigned to SGBC and REIBC, with the latter expected to outreach to its provincial members; (2) products/output was assigned to all three organizations; (3) the shift in the land development process was handed to REIBC; and (4) the advancing of principles and practices was assigned to UBC. In addition to identifying important characteristics of the partner communities where their pilot projects would unfold, the group also discussed specific roles for the partners.

The business plan of June 2003 states SGOG's intention of adopting a change management structure. By bringing together three organizations – one academic, one non-governmental, one professional association – to work in concert with local government, the assumption is that the structure will offer enhanced possibilities for administering an innovative project focused on implementing sustainability and smart growth in BC communities.

The MOU lists the roles that the individual partner organizations agreed to play in the initiative in considerable detail (see below). Here, more general descriptions of the partners and their roles are provided.

**Smart Growth BC**

Smart Growth is a North American-wide planning movement that emerged in the mid-1990s. It advocates for such things as

- Compact communities
- Sustainable transportation
- Affordable housing options
- Preservation of green space and agricultural land
- Efficient use of infrastructure, and
- Ongoing citizen engagement.

Smart Growth BC, a non-governmental organization that is part of the Canadian Smart Growth network operating in this province, opened its doors here in 1999. The organization’s overall role in SGOG is to oversee...
the initiative’s community outreach and engagement processes and conduct many of the communications and facilitation activities.

**The Design Centre for Sustainability at UBC**

The Sustainable Communities Program – now called The Design Centre for Sustainability at UBC – was a new initiative in the Centre for Landscape in 2003. The Program’s focus was on transcending the gap between academic research and the professional realm, with a key function being applied research pertaining to sustainable design and construction at all scales. One reason the Program was created was to enable UBC to become involved with SGOG. As the business plan states, the Program works closely with the James Taylor Chair (JTC) in Landscape and Liveable Environments, a research and outreach organization that has a tradition of working with citizens and public officials to incorporate and disseminate new and emerging policies for sustainable development into the broader community.

The Design Centre for Sustainability is generally expected to produce research and content material for SGOG’s outreach work, and with input from the JTC, undertake day-to-day planning and operation, with a key focus on research, design, and facilitation activities.

**Real Estate Institute of BC**

As the professional organization of BC’s real estate industry, the REIBC’s mission is to advance the highest standards of education, knowledge, professional development and business practice in all sectors of the industry.

REIBC’s major roles in SGOG are: (1) to act as economic consultant to the partner communities and produce an objective economic analysis of each community project; (2) to co-ordinate and facilitate two multi-stakeholder discussion forums in each community; (3) to produce an issue of *Input* magazine to smart growth and sustainable planning; and (4) to conduct outreach to members.

SGOG’s overall day-to-day activities are handled by the S gbc SGOG Planning Director and the UBC Director of the Design Centre for Sustainability (formerly the Sustainable Communities Program).
Anticipated Outcomes

Early on, SGOG identified seven benefits flowing out of its core partnership and its planned partnerships with 10 communities in BC over the 10-year period, 2003 to 2013.

- In 10 years, 10 BC communities will:
  - incorporate new housing (including affordable housing) and inclusive settings
  - protect watersheds and streams, and build compact, land-efficient communities and
  - create neighbourhood patterns that will reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas production.

- Redirect more than 10 billion dollars toward more sustainable development approaches.

- Citizens and community organizations in BC will have more choices for livable communities, be educated about sustainability and be increasingly engaged in land development processes.

- Build capacity for professionals in the land development process

- These and other professionals will gain new insight into land use regulation and urban design policies as they relate to sustainable development

- Elected officials will acquire an effective communication tool

- The real estate and development community will obtain a broader menu of options for designing more sustainable communities.

The 2003 business plan anticipates six broad outcomes by the end of SGOG’s initial three-year funding cycle. These are:

- Shift in the land development process
- Advancement of principles and practice
- Redirection of development investment
- Range of innovative local concept plans
- Educational and marketing products
- Outreach and education
Based on these broad outputs, the 2003 business plan listed the short and medium-term activities that were to focus SGOG’s work in its first three years. These activities are the focus of a matrix in Appendix G, in which the initiative’s progress towards its original objectives is gauged.

Roles of the Partner Organizations

The August 8, 2003 memorandum of agreement (MOU) lists what each of the three organizations agreed to undertake as a partner in SGOG.

**Smart Growth BC**

- Undertake fundraising and administrative activities (as set out in section 4 of the MOU)
- Coordinate and manage the Smart Growth on the Ground Advisory Committee (section 6.2) and the Project Committee for each partner community (section 6.3)
- Prepare a communications strategy and undertake communication activities, except in those cases where a partner agrees to handle a specific activity (e.g. presentations at conferences or seminars may be undertaken by all partner staff)
- Work with partner community staff to establish a Memorandum of Understanding and terms of reference for each Project Committee, workshops, charrette, follow up meetings, and production of plans.
- Liaise with council of partner community during the project period, including presentation of neighbourhood concept plans and other deliverables
- Coordinate with all groups in partner communities, including citizen groups, development groups, and government regulators at all levels of government
- Conduct stakeholder workshops and public education sessions with participants identified by each partner community
- Organize the charrette events in coordination with UBC and the partner community
- Liaise with regional, provincial, and federal level funding partners to ensure conformance with their requirements
- Assist partner community and UBC staff to produce by-laws, zoning amendments, and corporate reports for council action
- Assist partner community staff in review of first proposed development project for conformance with approved plans, and
organize round table sessions to resolve any issues outstanding between district, developer, and stakeholders that might emerge

The Design Centre for Sustainability at UBC

- Undertake fundraising and administrative activities (as per section 4 of the MOU)
- Assist SGBC with the production of educational materials
- Provide workshop materials necessary for stakeholder communication
- Participate in educational workshops with stakeholders
- Prepare design briefs
- Facilitate and staff charrette events
- Facilitate and staff follow up meetings with design table members
- Produce drawings and schematic community plans following charrette event
- Produce, with input from partner community staff, neighbourhood concept plan or local area plan necessary for council approval
- Provide targeted research
- Assist with presentation of neighbourhood concept plans and other deliverables to partner community councils
- Assist partner community staff in the production of by-laws, zoning amendments, and corporate reports for council action
- Assist partner community staff in review of first proposed development project for conformance with approved plans, and participate in roundtable sessions to resolve outstanding issues

Real Estate Institute of BC

- Undertake fundraising and administrative activities (as per section 4)
- Provide professional oversight related to real estate development and market issues
- Provide professional development and educational resources for REIBC members
- Develop and coordinate two public discussion forums per community
- Provide economic and real estate/development market expertise during charrette event and follow up events
- Provide ongoing market assessment as project proceeds
- Liaise with general public in selected communities, and the professional land use community
- Produce descriptive and educational documents used at workshops and to disseminate the results of this initiative BC wide, including a special issue of Input magazine devoted to SGOG.
SGOG’s Committees and Partner Communities

The August 8th, 2003 MOU also set out the role and make-up of three SGOG committees – namely, the executive, advisory and project committees – as well as the nature of SGOG’s relationship with its partner communities – the sites of its actual projects.

Very briefly, the MOU states that the executive committee, which consists of the director or executive director of the three partners as well as the James Taylor Chair in Landscape and Liveable Communities at UBC, is to provide decisions on such matters as funding, management, partner community selection, and so on. The advisory committee’s advice and direction is to be used in decisions taken by the executive committee.

SGOG is to receive guidance from a multi-sectoral advisory committee. This committee is to provide general guidance and advice on the SGOG initiative regarding fundraising, potential partner communities, and so on. Executive committee members are to attend all advisory committee meetings. As of October 2006, the membership of this committee included representatives from the municipal, regional, provincial and federal levels of government, primarily in the areas of planning and the environment, the real estate and land development industry, the non-profit and social sector, as well as SGOG’s executive committee. As it was struck originally, the advisory committee did not include members from the social services sector.

The partner communities are the selected places where SGOG engages in its 10-step public consultation and planning process (see below). Maple Ridge, Squamish and Greater Oliver have been SGOG’s first, second and third partner communities, respectively. A memorandum of understanding, which includes SGOG’s eight smart growth principles among other things, is drafted and signed by the Council in each participating partner community before the process begins. The partnership begins with the local Council’s approval of the MOU and ends with Council’s approval of the community’s neighbourhood or local area Concept Plan. The selection of partner communities is overseen by the executive committee, guided by the Partner Community Selection Criteria and draws on the advisory committee’s advice.

The project committee in each partner community keeps the SGOG partnership and the partner community advised on all aspects of the project specific to that community. Members of the project committee
include some members of the advisory committee as well as staff and elected officials from the locality.

SGOG 10-Step Process

The following 10-step process is repeated by SGOG in each of its partnering communities:

1. Community selection and agreement
2. Stakeholder consultation and workshops
3. Preparation of design brief
4. Organization of charrette
5. Facilitation of charrette
6. Targeted research
7. Finalization of neighbourhood or local area concept plan
8. Rezoning and construction participation
9. Monitoring and communication
10. Post-project evaluation

Step 1. Community selection and agreement

SGOG respects nine criteria (known as the Partner Community Selection Criteria) in the course of selecting a partnering community. These are:

- Official support – the council must vote in favour of partnering with SGOG and commit to the project through construction; it must also agree to the eight SGOG principles
- Community support – preference is given to communities with active neighbourhood, business, environmental and other groups
- Developer and property owner interest – preference is given to communities where members of the development industry are committed to the process, and where members interested in constructing initial projects exist
- Municipal resources – staff resources to support SGOG process must be committed, including funds for the engineering and servicing of the local areas or neighbourhoods
- Population size and growth – a minimum residential population of 5,000 people; experiencing population growth; and a pre-established need for a new or retrofitted community of 5,000 to 15,000 people.
- Appropriate site scale – sites for consideration should generally be about 500 acres, although a 1,000 acre site may be considered in special circumstances.
• Level of urbanization – early projects preferably in areas of greatest population density (so lessons learned can be most transferable)
• Risk/opportunity – projects characterized by great risk or opportunity may receive a higher priority
• Accordance with smart growth principles – where opportunities to introduce as many smart growth principles as possible exists

Step 2. Stakeholders, consultations and educational workshops
SGOG seeks broad-based interest and participation in its partner communities, and believes this must be secured from at least the following groups:

• Municipal officials
• Municipal staff
• Local developers and property owners
• Community organizations and individuals

Input is gathered from these groups through meetings and discussions with staff, including planners and engineers, elected officials, experts and organizations relevant to the community's future, and a variety of public workshops. In part this involves working with the partner community's project committee, which is itself comprised of elected officials, municipal staff and representatives of stakeholder groups in the community. With this committee's advice, a list of stakeholder groups and contact information is developed, plans for the opening forum and the educational workshops are made, and the events are staged.

Step 3. Preparation of Design Brief
The design brief is a booklet prepared by the SGOG team with local input that contains a detailed set of instructions to guide participants on the charrette team. It is a compilation of relevant material for undertaking the necessary discussion and design work, and includes excerpts from the community's official community plan, and other policies and by-laws relating to the (re)development area. It includes material on best management practices for sustainable development. And it includes input from the community, the project management committee, and major stakeholder groups in the community. This input is gathered through the public workshops, discussions with experts and organizations relevant to the community's future, and municipal planners. All of this information gathering assists in the formulation of goals, targets, and other design guidelines.
Step 4. Organization of charrette
According to the SGOG brochure, *Sustainability by Design*, a charrette is a collaborative planning process that helps integrate best practices and approaches into planning and design projects during their formative stages. It actively engages technical professionals, experts and key stakeholders. Charrettes take place in a roundtable format to explore a problem holistically, clarify project goals and objectives, to identify constraints, and to illustrate possibilities using the collective expertise, energy and interests of the group to generate design solutions.

SGBC and DCS staff co-ordinate and prepare for the design charrette, which is typically four days long, together with the municipal staff of the partnering community. Charrette teams have ranged in size somewhat: in Maple Ridge, 23 people participated in the charrette, in Squamish, the number was 32, and in Greater Oliver, 22 people were involved.

The members of the charrette belong to different stakeholder groups in the community. Each member is chosen to represent his or her respective group in the last workshop, just before the charrette. The different kinds of communities, the different kinds of plans they have undertaken, and the different stakeholder groups in the three places have all meant that the make-up of charrette teams has differed quite substantially in each place.

Step 5. Facilitation of charrette
Staff members from UBC’s DCS and SGBC tend to facilitate the charrette, although consultants are sometimes hired for this important task as well. Two senior SGOG staff members typically act as overall event facilitators. Usually around 10 staff members from DCS and SGBC attend the charrettes to serve as facilitators and designers. And a small number of staff members who supply technical resources are also on hand each day of the charrette.

Step 6. Targeted research
Targeted research takes place in between the charrette meetings, and is largely carried out by SGOG staff members, the UBC team in particular, but is sometimes contracted out to consultants as well. Technical bulletins are prepared to address the local issues that are identified in the charrette so that they can be resolved before the charrette phase is over. The nature of both the research and the technical bulletins prepared varies with the specificities of the case study. Market studies and other
economic analyses are conducted by REIBC staff or consultants contracted for the work.

Step 7. Finalization of neighbourhood or local area Concept Plan
After the participants of the charrette ‘design’ the local area or neighbourhood at issue the information is passed on to the SGOG team (mainly DCS and SGBC) who develop the ideas generated in charrette more thoroughly and prepare them for presentation in a more polished form. Once this is done, public hearings are held and, depending on the outcome, the district or town moves on to officially approve the local area Concept Plan or neighbourhood Concept Plan.

Step 8. Rezoning and construction participation
With the Concept Plan’s approval, the municipal staff in the partner communities are then responsible for processing any changes to the zoning by-law, the official community plan, and so on. Development applications in the Concept Plan area enter the municipal process in the usual way and building permits are issued following the usual procedures.

Step 9. Monitoring and communication
The partner communities’ municipal staff are also responsible for monitoring the implementation of the SGOG Concept Plans, and communicating progress to the local municipal council and stakeholder groups.

Step 10. Post-project evaluation
A post-project evaluation is to be undertaken after the council’s approval of the neighbourhood or local area Concept Plan. Such an evaluation was conducted by SGOG for the Maple Ridge project but not the other two case study communities.

Budget and Staff Resources

The MOU indicates that each partner is responsible for raising funds in its particular area for the SGOG partnership. REIBC applies separately for support for its portion of the project. Other funding applications may be prepared jointly, by a single partner, or with individual partner communities. To the greatest extent possible, SGBC and UBC should each attempt to raise funds in an amount that closely matches the individual needs of that partner, as estimated in the Financial Plan in the Smart Growth on the Ground Business Plan.
The 2003 business plan indicated that SGOG’s fundraising plan was to apply for funding from five core sponsors ($75,000 or more), namely BC Hydro, the Real Estate Foundation of BC, Environment Canada, Natural Sciences & Engineering Research Council of Canada (SERC), and Western Diversification. In addition, it would approach a list of donors ($50,000 to $75,000), including Social Sciences & Humanities Research. Each of the partners is responsible for making grant applications in their respective areas (e.g., academic grants by the Centre for Sustainable Design at UBC). Minutes from the Strategic Meeting of May 26, 2006 indicate that funding for the implementation stage of the SGOG process has been difficult to secure.

The MOU set out certain guidelines regarding staff resources. It specified, for example, that dedicated staff for the project is to be provided by SGBC and UBC, who each provide one full time senior level associate for the project. It stated that part time or full time staff can be hired to supplement them. And further, consultant services can be secured for charrette-based activities and planning documentation production.

**Brief Summaries of SGOG’s Three Case Studies**

**Maple Ridge**

In Maple Ridge, the SGOG process focused on the downtown area but, more specifically, the transformation of a mix of old and new buildings, residential and commercial developments, as well as riverfront industrial property into a vibrant downtown. The 400-hectare area includes heritage buildings, an assortment of existing businesses, and the location of the West Coast Express commuter train station.

Maple Ridge’s downtown has been designated by the GVRD as one of the town centres where growth is supposed to occur under the Liveable Region strategy. The redevelopment includes infill housing that helps to densify the area.

The process was scheduled at the outset to be 18 months in length. The initial public forum in January 2004, hosted by CBC’s Kevan Evans, attracted about 70 members of the public. Three public workshops were held in February and March in the new Maple Ridge Arts Centre and Theatre, and the charrette was held over a four day period in June. Council adopted the final concept plan later that year.
In Maple Ridge, the charrette team included representatives from the local police and fire departments, the local historical society, various government agencies, real estate agencies, a member of the local accessibility committee, and planning consultants, as well as local residents.

In Maple Ridge, the issues addressed in the research were mostly environmental ones. However, market studies were also carried out for residential and commercial development opportunities in Maple Ridge by a consultant.

The Maple Ridge project had an unexpected development to deal with part way through. Smart Growth BC issued a province-wide report during the Maple Ridge process that changed the local climate around the SGOG initiative quite significantly. The Sprawl Report 2004 assessed a number of BC municipalities according to 37 indicators and, to the indignation of many Maple Ridge residents, placed their community at the bottom of the list in terms of ‘livability’. The local media played up the report’s reception in the community, focusing on the mayor’s displeasure with Smart Growth BC and its affiliation with SGOG.

The SGOG team prepared a self-evaluation of the Maple Ridge experience for the project’s major funder, Environment Canada, once the year long process was complete. Called A Public Process for Smart Growth, the report describes a series of obstacles (controversial past projects and frustrating inaction) and a climate of skepticism (concern by some members of the public that SGOG wanted to impose a ‘green agenda’) that the process had to overcome. It also details the public outreach portion of the initiative in Maple Ridge. The evaluation concludes with the following lessons learned: (1) rely on citizen involvement; (2) use a local committee; (3) provide financial analysis; and (4) ensure the participation of higher levels of government.

Squamish

In Squamish, the SGOG process focused on creating a more attractive downtown area in the community. With the extreme pressures for growth in the community because of the 2010 Winter Olympics, Squamish has witnessed a lot of highway-oriented commercial development on its outskirts, along the Whistler highway. To investigate re-alignment of the Sea to Sky Highway, renew and densify the
community's downtown, and prop up the economic fortunes of business operators in the old downtown area, the District of Squamish (DOS) Council sought the assistance of SGOG to help it conduct a downtown Concept Plan.

In Squamish, the opening forum was held in mid-October, 2004, the charrette event extended from mid- to late April 2005, and the Downtown Squamish Concept Plan was adopted by the DOS Council in mid-October, 2005. The community’s charrette team was comprised of representatives from various government agencies, planning and environmental consultants, the Squamish Nation, the local arts council, a transit operator, a rail operator, real estate agencies and development companies, a local futures-oriented group, recreationalists, the chamber of commerce, and local residents. The research topics investigated by the SGOG team and others (at the direction of the workshop participants) ranged across affordable housing, parking, and energy management as well as a few other areas.

By the fall of 2005, several new downtown projects were going into the ground or entering planning stages at the DOS. In fact, on October 25, 2005, The Squamish Chief’s John French reported on a newly formed group called the Downtown Residents Action Group (DRAG) that had convened residents of the downtown for a meeting. DRAG stated in a news release, “development should be slowed while work on the regulation and protection elements of development is completed and brought into law. A spokesman for the group pointed to the Smart Growth on the Ground initiative, the Official Community Plan review and revisions to the building and zoning bylaw. He also noted the draft comprehensive environmental protection bylaw is also incomplete.”

**Greater Oliver**

In Greater Oliver, the SGOG process focused on the formulation and implementation of growth strategies to enable the Town and the surrounding rural area avoid urban sprawl. Local residents have recently witnessed unprecedented change and growth in their community, as new forms of agriculture have moved in to displace old ones, and as tourists and newcomers to the region have come in increasing numbers in response to the beauty of the south Okanagan.

In this project, SGOG partnered with both the Town of Oliver and the Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen (Area C). This arrangement
was intended to address the tensions between the town and the surrounding region, including the contentious issue of removing land from the Agricultural Land Reserve, for instance. SGOG conducted its opening forum in early November 2005, held the design charrette in early May 2006, and wound up its formal commitments to the Greater Oliver community in mid-December 2006 when the final Concept Plan received Council’s approval.5

The charrette team in Greater Oliver included representatives from youth, the regional district, the town, including the mayor, other government agencies, planning consultants, real estate agencies, as well as a small town character expert and area residents. The research carried out in response to local issues included studies of large format retail development, rural and town character, as well as environmental and other issues.

Self-Evaluations

The SGOG team has prepared two self-evaluations of its activities to-date. The first, a self-evaluation of the Maple Ridge experience that SGOG conducted for the project’s major funder, Environment Canada, was discussed above.

SGOG’s second self-evaluation was prepared after the charrette in Oliver was completed. The objective of this review, carried out by senior members of the SGOG team, was to inform a strategic planning session convened in late May 2006 for the purpose of going through a ‘preparatory review’. Meant to provide background information on the successes, failures, learnings and recommendations for the future of SGOG, it was also an effort to gain insight from SGOG’s key stakeholder groups on these matters. A brief questionnaire and telephone interviews with key SGOG members had been used. It was not intended to substitute for a full-scale evaluation, but rather prepare for it.

The full summary of the preparatory review (taken from the May 2006 meeting minutes) is presented below:

5 The Greater Oliver Concept Plan was approved after the research phase of this evaluation process was complete.
Meeting Our Objectives

- SGOG is generally a success; many short-term objectives have been met.
- It will take several years to evaluate outcomes.
- Some objectives are overly ambitious, e.g. the desire for built projects after 3 years.
- Some feel SGOG is having an influence (educating the public, encouraging more open planning processes, encouraging use of charrettes, ‘raising the bar’ for developers).
- Some feel SGOG is not influencing the provincial and federal governments.
- Implementation is slower than expected.
- Several felt REIBC could be more involved.

Strengths of the SGOG Initiative

- Combination of 3 organizations with different strengths.
- Variety of community types.
- Common principles in each community.
- Hands-on process.
- Process customized for each community.
- Intensive citizen education and involvement.
- Time commitment to each project.
- Comprehensive and multi-disciplinary.
- Attempt to include all stakeholders.
- Use of the charrette.
- High quality concept plans (e.g., concept plans)
- Commitment to follow up/evaluation.
- Neutral outside party.
- A defined ‘brand’.
- Unique in Canada.
- Demonstration or case study focus, to spread learnings to other communities.

Strategic Lessons We Have Learned

- There is a real demand for SGOG.
- Things do not happen as quickly as thought.
- General public appreciates the community involvement, supports more sustainable development, and tends to rally around the concept plan.
Current Model

- Does not appear sustainable in terms of human resources (too intense in an overly short time frame) or finances (fundraising has been difficult and is getting harder).
- One year in each community is not enough
- Many consider the budget to be too high.

Working with Communities

- Need to tailor the process to the individual community.
- Need to establish strong relationships with political leaders.
- Must pay attention to details in products.
- Must nurture relationships with elected officials and staff in partner communities.

Partnership

- Must be careful to evaluate resources and logistics (for budgeting purposes) in small, low-capacity communities.
- Partner organizations must ensure their other projects do not harm SGOG.
- Communications and fundraising can harm and even be fatal to SGOG if not well managed.
- Each organization must have good internal systems (esp. communications, financial).
- Need to ensure all organizations get appropriate recognition, and need joint communication plans for each.

Recommendations for Future Direction

- Some support for making refinements and improvements to the existing model; others suggested a new approach of reaching more communities simultaneously.
APPENDIX G: MATRIX

This section of the report presents the results of a key document review for Smart Growth on the Ground. The review has taken in the major reports and documents related to SGOG’s objectives, its implementation processes, and the issues it has dealt with over the past three years, as well as various materials related to its three pilot projects.

The key documents reviewed (and addressed below) include things that are not usually considered ‘documents’ – such as the minutes of SGOG’s executive and advisory committee meetings, and postings on SGOG’s website that pertain to the case study communities. Traditional documents also figure in the review, like the Memorandum of Understanding between Smart Growth BC, UBC and the Real Estate Institute, and the Business Plan of June 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth on the Ground Retreat, March 17, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The following documents are reviewed in this matrix:
| **Business Plan, June 2003** | A business plan was introduced that set out SGOG’s vision and mission statement, its six key objectives (stated above), the partnership’s organizational structure and roles, the main outcomes and activities over the short, medium and long-terms, key participants and stakeholders, a list of seven benefits flowing from the initiative, the 10-step process associated with SGOG, as well as plans for communications and marketing, fundraising, and finances.

Three project innovations are identified:
The partnership: a change management structure to implement sustainability and smart growth
The process: a 10-step process unique in its use of the multi-stakeholder charrette as a planning and design tool.
The implementation of principles: translating 8 guiding principles into community design and policy.

The budget is approximately $300,000 per community for the first 3 communities (for UBC and SGBC; REIBC has its own funding). |
| **Memorandum of Understanding, August 8, 2003** | The MOU confirms the agreement between UBC, SGBC and REIBC to form a partnership on the SGOG initiative in order ‘to assist selected communities in BC to meet their smart growth and sustainability goals via specific community development projects.’ The MOU repeats the description of SGOG found in the Business Plan, and sets out the vision, mission statement, and approach, the objectives, and understandings regarding funding and administration, roles of the partner organizations, and committees and partner communities.

In section 5, roles of the partner organizations, the MOU sets out 11 areas of responsibility for SGBC, 13 areas for UBC, and 8 for REIBC. |
### Case Study #1: Maple Ridge

#### Step 1. Community selection and agreement

By March 19, 2003:
- SGOG’s contacts with Maple Ridge (MR) have been made, and the status of the District of MR as the first project, and the approval from the District Council to be a municipal partner are both confirmed.
- The boundaries of the study site are established: it is to be a 500-acre site in the historic downtown core. The idea of adding a principle around heritage preservation is considered.

By June 16, 2003:
- MOU is in partner community’s hands.
- Later: District of Maple Ridge signs MOU with SGOG

#### Step 2. Stakeholder consultation and workshops

By July 10, 2003:
- Tentative date is set for opening event.
- Planning for workshops has begun, with smaller workshops to be conducted by SGBC and follow up workshop after charrette by REIBC.

By November 3, 2003:
- Scheduling for the public consultation process is about to begin with MR.

Stakeholder groups identified were:
- Professional/business services
- District of Maple Ridge
- Retail
- Other
- Government
- Entertainment businesses
- History, arts, recreation and culture developers
- Social issues
- Landowners
- Environment
- Residents of centre
- Youth

January 28, 2004:
- SGOG’s opening event – *Introduction to Smart Growth on the Ground in Maple Ridge* – attracted nearly 100 members of the public. The CBC’s Kevin Evans moderated the event. A questionnaire was distributed.
Five workshops were run in February and March:

February 18, 2004:
*Issues, Ideas and Opportunities*
Approximately 110 members of the public attended. Participants broke into 12 stakeholder groups. Trained facilitators (consisting of SGOG staff and volunteers) worked with each group, exploring the principles, brainstorming desired outcomes, etc.

March 3, 2004:
*Goals and Objectives - What Do We Want for the Maple Ridge Centre?*
Nearly 100 people attended and broke into the stakeholder groups. Prior to the workshop, the SGOG team analyzed relevant federal, provincial, regional, and local plans and policies.

March 25, 2004:
*Youth Workshop - Input from our Future Leaders*
A workshop convened at the local youth centre in response to the small youth turnout in the opening forum. Youth issues were discussed and input on the design targets for Workshop 3 was gathered.

March 25, 2004:
*Entertainment Business Workshop*
A similar kind of workshop convened for restaurant and pub operators unable to attend an evening event.

March 31, 2004
*Design Considerations - How Do We Reach Our Goals?*
Over 90 participants broke into groups based on 7 target issues:
- Population density
- Transportation options
- Energy sources and conservation
- Water use
- Rainwater systems
- Housing types and affordability
- Employment

Each of the 12 stakeholder groups elected one member to represent the group in the design charrette.
### Step 3. Preparation of design brief

April-May, 2004: The SGOG team converted the goals, objectives, design considerations and targets from the workshops into the design brief.

June, 2004: Design Brief complete.

### Step 4. Organization of charrette

April-May, 2004: The SGOG team coordinated the design charrette. The SGOG team coordinated research on six selected issues reviewed and approved by District staff and the project committee. These are:
- Reducing auto dependence
- Water consumption
- Rainwater management
- Energy management
- Residential development market
- Commercial development market

The charrette team consisted of 20 members, including 11 community representatives, 5 District representatives, and 4 representatives from federal, provincial and regional agencies.

### Step 5. Facilitation of charrette

May 31, 2004: Open house preceding the design charrette. 50 people in attendance.

June 1, 2004: The four day design event began. The team consisted of 20 members. 10 people served as facilitators for the charrette, including staff from the SGOG partner organizations and sub-consultants. Carefully chosen to ensure they would respond to the members of the charrette team rather than direct them, the facilitators were primarily designers by training. Four issue groups were created:
- Go (mobility)
- Green (infrastructure such as greenways, parks, and habitat areas)
- Community (land use)
- Buildings and Energy (green building designs and energy sources and conservation)

Each group created a framework vision for the project area. The groups were then reconstituted on a geographic basis: north, south, east, west downtown), so that each group had at least one member from the previous issue teams. The framework elements from issue areas were then brought to bear in different precincts of the downtown.
| Step 6. Targeted research | Six research areas (described above) became the topics of technical bulletins printed in June, 2004:  
No. 1 Reducing Automobile Dependency in Maple Ridge  
No. 2 Water Consumption in Maple Ridge  
No. 3 Rainwater Management in Maple Ridge  
No. 4 Energy Management in Maple Ridge  
No. 5 Residential Development Opportunities in Maple Ridge  
No. 6 Commercial Development Opportunities in Maple Ridge |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Step 7. Finalization of neighbourhood or local area concept plan | Maple Ridge Concept Plan receives Council’s approval.  
April 2005:  
Maple Ridge Concept Plan is released. |
### Step 8. Rezoning and construction participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>The executive summary of the Concept Plan states that “Implementation activities include review of this Concept Plan by Council; subsequent analysis and amendments to the Official Community Plan, the zoning by-law and other regulations; and on-going research and capacity-building. Other activities will be added as implementation progresses.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| October 26, 2005 | The Maple Ridge News reports that 12 new buildings in the downtown area are at some stage of application, according to the District’s environmental services manager. Once built, the new condominiums and apartment units will house another 2,200 people in the downtown core. The projects, at various stages of application, are:  
  - An 87-apartment seniors’ building (Phase 2 of Willow Manor)  
  - A 232-apartment building on 224th Street  
  - Apartments at 22333 – 122nd Avenue  
  - 67-apartment building on 224th Street  
  - 74-apartment seniors’ building on Richie Avenue  
  - 58-apartment building on Dewdney Trunk Road  
  - 30-apartment building on River Road  
  - 157-unit 16-storey high-rise tower on 228th Street  
  - 101-apartment building on Callaghan Avenue  
  - 10 townhouses on 228th Street  
  - 4 single-family homes on 228th Street |
| January 14, 2006 | The SGOG website reports the following activities are making the Concept Plan a reality in Maple Ridge:  
  - The District lifted the requirement for ground-floor shops in every building downtown  
  - Several new residential buildings have been proposed  
  - The renovations to the District’s community safety building will meet national LEED standards for green buildings  
  - The District is encouraging developers to build green buildings too, and is considering incentives  
  - The organization 1,000 Friends of Maple Ridge was formed. |

### Step 9. Monitoring and communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March, 2003 | A domain name was being registered for the Smart Growth on the Ground website  
  - SGOG uses the website to post up-dates regarding the implementation of the Concept Plan among other things. |
### Step 10. Post-project evaluation

November, 2004:
SGOG released a self-evaluation of the Maple Ridge case study for the project’s major funder, Environment Canada. Called *A Public Process for Smart Growth*, the report identifies ‘a number of critical challenges in Maple Ridge’, including ‘a skeptical climate’ due to controversial past projects and frustrating inaction, and a some members of the community felt that SGOG was imposing a ‘green agenda’ on MR.

SGOG believed that its process responded to these challenges with its skilled facilitation in the charrette, its breadth of stakeholder representation, and its educational workshops. Still, barriers to the acceptance of environmental concepts remained: the District of MR felt the lack of senior government support for environmental initiatives, more research was required, and the DOMR did not have the staff capacity to do it.

Lessons learned: rely on citizen involvement, use a local committee, provide financial analysis, and ensure higher level government participation.

### Case Study #2: Squamish

#### Step 1. Community selection and agreement

By November 3, 2003:
SGOG contacts District of Squamish to explore support for an MOU between the District, the SGOG team, and the Ministry of Transportation.

SGOG’s Advisory Committee recommends that Squamish become the 2nd case study community.

September 2004:
Signing of MOU between the District of Squamish and the SGOG team.
Time expected until completion: 18 months.
| Step 2. Stakeholder consultation and workshops | October 14, 2004:  
*Opening Forum* – Roughly 85 residents, business people, recreationalists and other members of the community attend. CBC’s Kevan Evans moderates the event for a second time.  
November 24 and 25, 2004:  
A series of workshops are held with various groups in Squamish, including businesspeople, developers/property owners, residents, environmentalists, educators, community group representatives, and recreationalists. Participants set priorities for design and research activities. SGOG prepares worksheets for these. SGOG prepares a summary of all discussions.  
Other meetings throughout the SGOG process occurred with environmental regulators, transportation officials, economic development and housing researchers. The SGOG team also held workshops with the youth leadership of two local secondary schools.  
February 2005:  
*Preparing for Action: A Learning Event* – A series of speakers made presentations on the following background research topics: Population  
Market Opportunities  
Geologic Hazards  
Eco-Industrial Networking  
Housing  
Visualizing Density  
Participants later met in group workshops then discussed draft targets for the design process.  
February 15-17, 2005:  
A second group of workshops was held.  
Stakeholder groups identified were:  
Developers and property owners  
The environment  
Educators  
The arts, culture and social services  
Recreation  
Business  
Residents |
### Step 3. Preparation of design brief

The design brief draws material from four general sources:
- Input from the public during the workshop phase
- Best management practices for sustainable development
- Existing policy at all levels of government
- Relevant experts and organizations

April 2005:
Design Brief is released

### Step 4. Organization of charrette

Late February-Mid-April, 2005:
The SGOG team coordinated the design charrette. The SGOG team coordinated research on eight selected issues reviewed and approved by District staff and the project committee. These are:
- Affordable Housing
- Urban Agriculture
- Floodplain Development & Construction
- Sense of Place
- Parking
- Natural Hazards
- Eco-Industrial Networking
- Energy Management

The charrette team consisted of 32 members, including 6 District representatives, and 3 representatives from federal, provincial and regional agencies, as well as a single representative of the Squamish Nation.
### Step 5.
**Facilitation of charrette**

April 18, 2005:
*Charrette Kick Off* – as above, in MR. 42 people attend.

April 21, 2005:
*Charrette Mid-Course Review* – The charrette team presented their draft recommendations that generally received positive feedback.

April 28, 2005:
*Charrette Presentation and Open House* – Over 100 people attended this event in which the charrette team presented the polished version of their work (as prepared by the SGOG team).

The charrette team calls for a new Blind Channel bridge, a controversial proposal for a new entry into the town centre.

A team of 13 facilitators and resource people provided the facilitation skills and the technical skills necessary to mount the charrette.

A post-charrette workshop originally slated for the real estate and development industry is not held.

### Step 6.
**Targeted research**

Eight research areas (described above) became the topics of foundation research bulletins printed in April, 2005:

No. 1 Affordable Housing
No. 2 Urban Agriculture
No. 3 Floodplain Development & Construction
No. 4 Sense of Place
No. 5 Parking Strategies
No. 6 Natural Hazards and Risk
No. 7 Eco-Industrial Networking
No. 8 Energy Management in Squamish

### Step 7.
**Finalization of neighbourhood or local area concept plan**

August, 2005:
Draft version of the Concept Plan complete.

October, 2005
Downtown Squamish Concept Plan is released.

October 18, 2005:
The District of Squamish Council approves the Concept Plan. Council directed District staff to use the plan as a guide for development until a formal Sub-Area Plan can be adopted for downtown.

14 months of planning work has transpired.
### Step 8. Rezoning and construction participation

December 2, 2005: *The Squamish Chief* quotes a spokesman for Pridham Development Inc., which is redeveloping the old Interfor mill lands with residential units, a lagoon and a public park, as saying “Our vision for the site was very much founded on the now approved Smart Growth on the Ground principles...”

By January 14, 2006: The SGOG website reports the following activities are making the Concept Plan a reality in Squamish:
- The draft Official Community Plan (OCP) of October 11, 2005 contains a Sustainability Commitment (page 9) that was inspired by SGOG.
- A Downtown Sub-Area Plan will make the SGOG recommendations a formal part of the OCP.
- West Coast Environmental Law is helping Squamish with new subdivision by-laws, environmental standards, and a smart growth checklist.
- New downtown developments are being reviewed against recommendations of the SGOG Concept Plan.
- Capilano College is exploring their options for an expanded downtown Squamish campus.
- The Bridging to the Future project will assist Squamish with energy planning for a growing population.
- A natural hazards study will continue research on the effect of earthquake, landslide and flood risks on development planning.
- New research will quantify the benefits of tree coverage on air quality and rainwater management in downtown Squamish.

### Step 9. Monitoring and communication

SGOG uses its website to post up-dates regarding the implementation of the Concept Plan among other things.

### Step 10. Post-project evaluation

No post-project evaluation has been conducted specifically for the Squamish project.
Case Study #3: Greater Oliver

| Step 1. Community selection and agreement | December 2004 (approx.): The Oliver and District Community Economic Development Society convince the Town of Oliver and the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen to jointly apply for partner community status with SGOG.

SGOG’s Advisory Committee recommends that Oliver become 3rd case study community. |


Key stakeholder groups identified were:
- Town residents
- Rural residents
- Youth
- Business/Economic development (tourism)
- Developer/landowner
- Agriculture
- Environment
- Recreation/culture/education/social.

November 2, 2005: Opening Forum

December 6, 2005: Preparing for Action
A series of presentations on the following topics:
- Visions of the Osoyoos Indian Band
- Climate Change
- Planning for Agriculture
- Making Sense of Place in Planning
- Water Resources
- Visualizing Density
- Desert and Grassland Habitats
- Farming and Land Use
- Big Box Stores
- Water Sustainability
- Affordable Housing

January 10-11, 2006: Setting Priorities |
## Step 3. Preparation of design brief

The design brief draws material from four general sources:
- Input from the public during the workshop phase
- Best management practices for sustainable development
- Existing policy at all levels of government
- Relevant experts and organizations

May 2006:
Design Brief is released.

## Step 4. Organization of charrette

March-April, 2006:
The SGOG team coordinated the design charrette.
The SGOG team coordinated research on eight selected issues reviewed and approved by District staff and the project committee. These are:
- Climate change and water
- Rainwater management
- Water conservation
- Conservation of Biodiversity
- Affordable housing
- Large Format Retail
- Rural and Town Character
- Planning for the Needs of Agriculture

The charrette team included:
- Community members elected by their peers in workshops
- Elected officials and staff from the Town and Regional District
- Experts and representatives of other key agencies
### Step 5. Facilitation of Charrette

- **May 9, 2006:**
  Open house preceding the design charrette.
- **May 10, 2006:**
  The four day design event began
  The team consisted of 22 members.
  11 people served as facilitators for the charrette, including staff from the SGOG partner organizations and sub-consultants. Carefully chosen to ensure they would respond to the members of the charrette team rather than direct them, the facilitators were primarily designers by training.
  Three SGOG staff members provided technical assistance for the charrette.
- **May 11, 2006:**
  *Charrette Mid-Course Review*
- **May 16, 2006:**
  *Charrette Presentation*

A post-charrette workshop originally slated for the real estate and development industry is not held.

### Step 7. Finalization of Neighbourhood or Local Area Concept Plan

Eight research areas (described above) became the topics of foundation research bulletins printed in April, 2006:
- No. 1 Climate Change and Water Resources
- No. 2 Rainwater Management
- No. 3 Water Conservation
- No. 4 Conservation of Biodiversity and Ecological Function
- No. 5 Affordable Housing
- No. 6 Large Format Retail
- No. 7 Rural and Town Character
- No. 8 Planning for the Needs of Agriculture

- **December 18, 2006:**
  The Town of Oliver and the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen Councils approve the Concept Plan.

### Step 8. Rezoning and Construction Participation

- **By January 14, 2006:**
  The SGOG website reports the following could make the Concept Plan a reality in Greater Oliver:
  - By-law changes
  - Review of catalyst development projects
  - Other activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 9. Monitoring and communication</th>
<th>SGOG uses its website to post up-dates regarding the implementation of the Concept Plan among other things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 10. Post-project evaluation</td>
<td>No post-project evaluation has yet been conducted specifically for the Greater Oliver project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Charlotte Ciok, formerly of Real Estate Institute of BC
Patrick Condon, Design Centre for Sustainability
Allan Corbett, Real Estate Institute of BC
Cheeying Ho, Smart Growth BC
Shana Johnstone, Design Centre for Sustainability
Stephen Mullock, Real Estate Institute of BC
Jodie Siu, Smart Growth BC