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ABSTRACT

This paper assesses the extent to which Rethink London exemplifies the tenets of collaborative planning. Rethink London was an innovative, community driven approach to planning whose main objective was to collaboratively engage the London community in creating a shared vision for urban development. The assessment was done using the process criteria focusing on issues such as equal opportunities and resources, inclusive representation, self design, independent facilitation, effective process management, voluntary participation and commitment, accountability, high quality information, purpose and incentives and clear ground rules. These factors were operationalised into concrete interview questions that were used to collect data through semi-structured interviews with local political leaders, community leaders and municipal officials. Primary data was complemented by documentary analysis of Rethink London secondary material including reports and discussion papers.

Rethink London was a complex planning exercise with multiple and often conflicting interests. In such circumstances, it is impractical to design a process that satisfy all the ideals and principles of collaborative planning. Despite the power imbalances and conflicting priorities, Rethink London performed well. It created opportunities to include majority of the interested stakeholders in shaping the future of London’s development planning. This was done through an appropriate mix of methods of participation which were designed to meet the differing capacities of participants. Given the complexity of a city-wide planning project, the paper recommends that careful consideration must be taken in process design. The process criteria should be viewed in an integrated manner for the best benefits of CP to be realised.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction

The idea of stakeholder participation in planning processes in local governments has occupied a central place in theory and practice over the last two decades (Murtagh, 2004:455). The emphasis on peoples’ involvement in plan-making processes has gained momentum since the early 1990s (Healey, 1997, Fischer and Forester, 1993, Kumar and Paddison, 2000). In terms of public participation, there is no single framework that can be applied universally in all planning contexts. Recently, collaborative planning has gained popularity as an approach to planning that emphasizes stakeholder participation. Under this approach, the basic assumption is that decision making processes should involve those individuals or groups who will be mostly impacted by the planning outcome (McGee, 2006)

According to Innes and Booher (2015), collaborative planning belongs to the family of communicative planning theories that emerged in the 1980s and 1990s. It is an inclusive dialogic approach to shaping social space influenced by an acknowledgement of the complexities of planning problems and the need to involve multiple stakeholders in decision making (Brand and Gaffikin, 2007). In collaborative planning, citizens/residents and other stakeholders are invited to participate in planning or decision-making processes with methods such as questionnaires, web forums, public meetings and field trips, with the idea that participation can influence the content of planning (see Healey 1997; Innes 1998; Innes and Booher, 1999). In its ideal sense, CP brings all relevant stakeholders together for face-to-face negotiations that result in administrative

---

Stakeholders are generally those who have an interest in or are affected by a decision, including those that have influence or power in a situation. Examples include residents, businesses, community organizations, interest group, nongovernmental organizations, First Nations, Government et c.
decisions around a specific issue (Gunton and Day, 2003). However, in a range of settings in which participatory activities have flourished, they have failed to deliver significant changes in prevailing practices of local governments (Bickerstaff and Walker, 2005; Connelly, 2006). In municipal governments, a case in point is the preparation of official land-use plans in which divergent interests and values are usually at play.

1.2. Purpose of the paper

The purpose of this paper is to use an evaluative framework to assess the potential and the challenges of implementing CP in a large-scale planning process where process designers explicitly pursued CP goals. The research question which the paper seeks to answer is to what extent does Rethink London exemplify the principles of CP? The paper will discuss how the City of London operationalised the principles of CP during the review of its official plan. It examines the application of collaborative planning in the Rethink London plan-making process, after two years of stakeholder engagement and consultation with a diverse group of local stakeholders between 2011 and 2013. London represents an interesting case to study because the City embarked on an innovative, community driven approach to land-use planning, which is different from the traditional, top-down technocratic processes.

In accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Planning Act, municipalities must review their official plans every five years. Beginning 2011, the City of London initiated a comprehensive review of its official plan. The process started with a broader community conversation and public engagement process named Rethink London. Rethink London’s main goal was to collaboratively engage the London community in developing a shared vision for urban growth and development. The process was guided by principles such as shared responsibility, accessibility to information, mutual respect and inclusion, transparency and responsiveness. The City also emphasised the need
to respect diversity in opinions of those participating in Rethink London. The objectives, principles and values of Rethink London indicate that the City was clearly committed to a collaborative planning process, but that did not full answer the question of how to realise a successful CP process. Rethink London experienced intrinsic challenges in realising CP given the large-scale nature of the planning exercise and the existence of many and often opposed interests. By assessing Rethink London using the CP framework, the paper develops three types of useful information. First, it provides planning practitioners with important data about improvements required for future CP process design. Second, it contributes to the growing body of literature on participatory planning. Third, it provides insights on the relevance and usefulness of the evaluative frameworks for assessing CP processes in different contextual settings.

1.3. Outline of the Report

This research report is divided into six chapters. Chapter one is the introduction and context of the paper. It sets the tone for the paper by highlighting the brief academic debates on the theory of collaborative planning. Chapter two provides a brief a history of CP, outlines its strengths and weaknesses, its prominence as a new model of planning and governance, highlights the preconditions for a successful CP process and discusses the different assessment frameworks that scholars have developed. Chapter three explains the research design and methodology used in answering the research question. To fully understand the Rethink London case study, it must be viewed within the broader context of land-use planning in Ontario. An overview of the land-use planning framework in Ontario is presented, followed by an outline of the research context and a synopsis of the London plan-making process. This will be followed by a discussion of selected case studies, where evaluative frameworks have been operationalised or applied. The case studies are selected from B.C as they provide useful insights on how to measure the effectiveness of land-
use planning processes. The assessment framework was operationalised into interview questions that were used to collect data from participants who were involved in the planning process—local political leaders, community leaders and municipal officials. The results of the interview process and documentary analysis are presented in chapter four. In a complex planning process, it is difficult to satisfy all the principles of collaborative planning. Power imbalances and conflicting interests were evident in the Rethink London case study, which made it challenging to negotiate towards a shared vision. Nevertheless, this does not mean the process was a failure. It created opportunities for involving a diverse range of stakeholders who were interested in the planning issues. Chapter five presents a more integrated analytical discussion that relates the different elements of Rethink London to each other, and back to CP literature. Chapter six wraps up the paper by presenting concluding remarks and recommendations and areas for further research.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

This chapter demonstrates how CP has emerged as an alternative to traditional, top-down planning approaches. The strengths and challenges of CP are presented based on empirical cases from Canada and the United States. It also highlights the different assessment frameworks that have been developed by scholars to evaluate CP processes.

2.1. Historical Background of Collaborative Planning

Collaborative planning emerged in the 1960s and 70s as an alternative to the mainstream planning practices of the time. After the Second World War, development planners in North America relied on a traditional planning approach referred to in the literature as the rational comprehensive model or ‘technocratic planning’ (Sandercock, 1998; Harper and Stein, 2006). Through this model, governments-imposed plans on the local landscape. These plans were produced with limited opportunities for public consultations (Sandercock, 1998; Beierle and Cayford, 2002; Gunton and Day, 2003; Jackson and Curry, 2004). However, the 1960s saw the growing dissatisfaction with technocratic planning. Citizens began to question merits of top-down planning approaches. The traditional approach tended to homogenize public interests but failed when applied to a distinctly heterogeneous society (Susskind et al., 2003). Civil society started pushing for greater accountability and participation in public decision-making.

Citizens began to understand that government-led planning no longer adequately represented public interests. Citizens were dissatisfied with their inability to influence land use decisions (Sandercock, 1998). Legitimacy and public buy-in were increasingly difficult for planners to obtain because people felt ignored in their demands for greater democracy (Sandercock, 1998).
2.2. Collaborative planning as the new model of planning

Innes and Booher (2003b) argue that collaborative planning is gaining prominence as an alternative to traditional, top-down planning models. Under the CP model, the planning process must involve a broad array of stakeholders for the plans to have significant effect on the actions of local governments (Burby, 2003). When issues do not attract the interest of potential stakeholders, planners do not benefit from this local knowledge and they are unlikely to learn about potential opposition to their proposals (ibid, 2003: 34).

Collaborative Planning is the new paradigm of planning for a complex contemporary society which usually mediates conflicts between parties through consensus-building processes (Healey, 1996; Kumar and Paddison, 2000). CP encourages people to be engaged in a dialogue in a situation of equal empowerment and shared information and to create innovative outcomes and to build institutional capacity (Innes and Booher, 2004; Healey, 2006). Healey (2006) argues that CP is also a social learning process, whose main feature is inclusionary argumentation. Through inclusionary argumentation, consensus-building processes are expected to build trust and establish new power relations among participants.

2.3. The Collaborative Planning Framework

The general collaborative framework follows three basic stages: pre-negotiation, negotiation and post-negotiation (Gunton and Day, 2003, Margerum, 2002; Susskind et al., 2003). During pre-negotiation, a team from the local authority might convene to identify relevant stakeholders as well as recruiting stakeholder representatives and drafting Terms of Reference (TORs).

The negotiation stage typically begins with stakeholders sharing their interests in the process outcomes, adopting the TORs, and setting general rules of conduct. With all interests on the table,
stakeholders begin brainstorming scenarios that have the potential to provide collective gains. Stakeholders may convene into subcommittees dedicated to gathering missing information or developing solutions that require specific expertise. Once a set of scenarios is identified, each is evaluated, and a selection is made by consensus (Gunton and Day, 2003, Margerum, 2002; Susskind et al., 2003). Post-negotiation involves completion of the plan document and securing legal approval and/or implementing the outcomes of the process. Some outcomes must be approved or ratified into law by a designated authority such as a government or court. Lastly, any other administrative hurdles that are required before plan implementation begins are addressed (Gunton and Day, 2003, Margerum, 2002; Susskind et al., 2003). In the next section, I discuss the different frameworks that have been proposed to measure CP processes.

2.4. Frameworks for assessing collaborative planning processes

The growing body of academic literature on evaluating collaboration (Webler and Tuler, 2006) has not yet provided an agreed position on principles and methods for evaluating collaborative planning (Rowe and Frewer, 2004; Laurian and Shaw, 2009). Innes and Booher (1999) argue that the assessment of a collaborative process can be done by looking at whether the process (i) includes representatives of all the relevant and different interests, (ii) is self-governing, allows participants to decide on the ground rules, objectives and tasks and (iii) seeks consensus only after discussion have fully explored the issues and interests and find creative responses to differences.

CP process can also be assessed by looking at the availability of adequate high-quality information (Faehnle and Tyrväinen, 2013). The experiential information obtained during the process should cover diverse themes, such as local history and desirable futures. At the same time, it should reveal the voices of diverse groups of the potentially affected population and ideally be representative in
demographic terms (Reed, 2008). It is also necessary to try to find ways to get information from those groups that cannot be reached with conventional methods.

For Beierle and Cayford (2002), the success of a participatory process depends on whether it improved the quality of the decisions. In a successful participatory planning process, stakeholders are actively informed about essential issues and their opportunities to find necessary information are ensured. Active informing can be evaluated in terms of how appropriate the forms of information are for stakeholders (Lockwood, 2010) and how successfully the essential information is delivered at the right time. Participatory planning can also be assessed by looking at the extent to which adequate opportunities to participate are created, including conscious mix of collaborative methods to welcome different stakeholders (Faehnle and Tyrväinen, 2013: 336).

2.5. **Empirical Findings on Collaborative Planning**

Before a CP planning process is adopted, it is important for policy-makers to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. Professionals need to answer questions such as: how effective has bee collaborative planning in similar cases elsewhere and is CP better at reaching consensus than other approaches? Key findings from formal evaluations are essentially divisible into two types of useful information: (i) Empirical evidence that either supports or rejects the use of CP in relation to other strategies by highlighting strengths and challenges; (ii) identification of pre-conditions for successful collaboration.
2.6. Strengths of Collaborative Planning

Scholars who advocate for CP have argued that it offers several advantages over traditional, technocratic processes which are usually driven by experts (Gunton and Day, 2003; Healey, 1997, 1998; Innes and Booher, 1999; Wondolleck and Yaffee, 2000). Some of the major strengths of collaborative planning are its ability to foster representation, high-quality decisions and its potential to produce a legitimate and implementable plan.

2.6.1. Representation

One main goal of CP is better stakeholder representation in decision-making. But, to what extent are all relevant stakeholder groups represented in CP processes? Using participant interviews, documentary analysis and direction observations, Innes (1996) found that in 7 of 8 Californian cases all stakeholder interests were well represented. In three of those cases, groups actively sought additional stakeholders who had not initially recognized their interest in the issue.

2.6.2 Implementability and Legitimacy of plans

Collaborative planning is also thought to be an effective approach to enhance the legitimacy of public policies. Engaging citizens in the planning processes enhances the acceptability of a plan by its future users (Burby, 2003; Brody et al., 2003). Better representation provides the process with more legitimacy in the eyes of participants and the public and therefore increases the level of buy-in toward the process and its outcomes. Studies in Canada and elsewhere show that,

*perceptions of procedural fairness have a significant impact on attitudes and behaviour,*

*and that people who believe they have been treated fairly are more likely to accept a decision, even where the outcome has gone against them* (Jackson and Curry, 2004:30).
Selin et al.’s (2000) finding confirms that most participants viewed the process they were involved in as credible.

### 2.6.3. Innovative, High Quality Decisions

Agreements reached through CP may be of higher quality because of increased dialogue and the broad array of experience and knowledge multiple stakeholders bring to the dialogue platform. Brabham (2009) highlights that non-expert knowledge from members of the public is critical in generating innovative ideas to map out planning decisions. This is supported by Van Herzele (2004) who states that inclusion of non-expert knowledge is useful to the planning process in general, since the perspectives of individuals outside of the professional context of planning can (re)discover creative solutions that can work in an explicit local context. Despite the positive traits embedded in CP, there are some challenges associated with the process.

### 2.6.4. New Shared Knowledge base

A by-product of the collaborative planning process is the plan document, which acts as a framework for implementation. However, before the document there are various activities including studies, spatial data, cultural knowledge and other information that provide invaluable project support. During collaborative policymaking for the San Francisco Estuary Project, Connick and Innes (2003) found the following:

“...discussions, along with detailed examinations of the analyses, predictions and models helped create trust in a shared set of data and a deeper understanding among stakeholders of technical issues, and they resulted in improved information” (p. 186).
This evidence suggests that CP creates a valuable shared-knowledge base for those participating. This increases intellectual capital and provides a key resource during plan implementation and future planning projects (Frame et al., 2004).

2.7. Challenges associated with Collaborative Planning

CP critics have moved beyond the technocratic versus participatory debate to focus on problems within participatory processes (Huxley, 2000, Sandercock, 1998, Miraftab, 2009). In this section, the general criticisms of participatory planning approaches are discussed. These challenges include power imbalances, unrepresentativeness, unresolved conflicts, participant attrition and potential to undermine public accountability.

2.7.1. Power Imbalances in planning process and decision making

So far, literature has shown that CP addresses power imbalances between planners and stakeholders by giving stakeholders decision-making authority. CP also attempts to address power imbalances among stakeholders by using consensus-based decisions. However, in the real world, participants do not always come to the negotiating table equal (Susskind et al., 2003; Gunton and Day, 2003; Cullen et al, 2010; Cornwall, 2003). Powerful stakeholders such as government and industry representatives have the potential to easily manipulate the process to their own advantage (Gunton and Day, 2003). One respondent in Margerum’s (2002) study stated,

“At first glance, citizen members have better than equal representation on the committee; but in practice this is often not the case because their attendance is not always certain, and they are not paid, but mainly because representatives of government departments have much greater access to office assistance, photocopying, printing, and research. Hence,
they can drive agendas with superior presentation, leapfrogging and squeezing out some citizen-initiated items” (p. 249).

This was confirmed in a study by Scholz and Stiftel (2005), in which participants confirm that more powerful stakeholders from industry, government and NGOs can exert influence on the planning process at the expense of less powerful stakeholders.

2.7.2. Participant Burn-out or Attrition

CP processes usually take long to complete, as such it might be difficult to maintain commitment of all participants. In many cases, stakeholders are not compensated for their time, particularly if they are representing NGOs or community groups. If the demands of volunteering become too great relative to the demands of regular life, participants may exit the process. Participant burnout also has impacts within the process when decisions are made simply to ‘get on with it’ rather than by truly collaborative discourse. In Moote et al.’s (2002) case study the process began with more than 400 participants at inception and was whittled down to less than 40 two years later.

2.7.3. Unrepresentative

Scholars argue that despite the inclusion of multiple stakeholders and/or sector representatives is an improvement in representation relative to technocratic planning, these individuals do not depict a complete picture of the society (Wondolleck and Yaffe, 2000). In most circumstances, interest groups consist of small groups of people who advocate for specific issues but might not necessarily represent the values and interests of a community. A study by Beierle and Cayford (2002) confirmed that 60% of 63 cases did not involve participants that were representative of the public. Moote et al. (1997) discovered that 70% of respondents felt some interests were excluded from the
process by lack of access. These insights mean that including multiple participants does not automatically result in a representative process.

2.7.5. Potential to undermine public accountability

When elected officials shift decision making authority to non-elected stakeholders, this may give officials a chance to bypass the mainstream democratic process (Wondolleck and Yaffee, 2000; Frame et al, 2004). In doing so, officials may become unaccountable for any negative impacts of the planning agreement. In a study by Moote et al. (1997), participants complained that the process was too controlled by the government, shifting decision making responsibility from the appropriate institution.

2.7.6. Increased or Unreduced Conflict

Scholars have argued that contrary to CP’s intentions, the approach can intensify existing tensions between participants and or stakeholders. In cases where participants and stakeholders might not be willing to negotiate in good faith, CP can create problems. Even if consensus might be reached, the possibility of a negative relationship can extend beyond the process or a particular project, which can undermine social capital. In their study, Leach et al. (2002) discovered that 28% of surveyed stakeholders agreed or strongly agreed that there were frequent clashes between experts and non-experts over technical issues. Margerum (2002) confirms that positional tactics used by some stakeholders “endangered ongoing relationships amongst participants” (p. 32). Participants in Moote et al.’s (1997) case study did not reach consensus partly due to internal conflicts among stakeholders. Worse, the “divisiveness and hostility that is still felt by some participants-and has even been exacerbated by this process – is evidence of its overall failure to reduce conflict and thereby facilitate plan implementation” (Moote, et al., 1997, p. 885).
2.8. Pre-Conditions for Effective Collaborative Processes

To better understand the dynamics of public participation in collaborative processes, scholars such as Ansell and Gash (2008), Innes and Booher (2004, 2003a and 2003b) and Burby (2003) have outlined the pre-conditions necessary for collaborative policymaking. Burby (2003) highlights that participatory processes enable planners to enlighten stakeholders on often poorly comprehended problems and policy issues. This build understanding and incentives for collaboration.

The effectiveness of the collaborative process depends on the ability of the planner and or the municipality to listen and learn. The two-way learning can only happen when the necessary conditions for dialogue are fulfilled. In this case, planners and other stakeholders are likely to enjoy rather than dismiss participation as an interesting learning experience (Innes and Booher, 2004).

Ansell and Gash (2008) argue that institutional design sets the basic ground rules whereas Innes and Booher (2003b) believe that the participants should define their own ground rules rather than being dictated to them by an external authority. For collaboration to be effective, there is also need for a facilitator. Ansell and Gash (2008) state that a way to increase trust between stakeholders is to add a facilitator, a person who does not have biased interests in the topic in question. This could be the planner, or a person hired specifically for the collaboration process. Thus, the participants feel safer and more comfortable in participating in the dialogues (Innes and Booher, 2003). This is only practical in engagement strategies that involve extended dialogue and face to face discussions and might not be useful where online strategies are used.

To improve participatory planning processes, Burby (2003) suggests that planners do the following: provide information to as well as listen to citizens; empower citizens by providing
opportunities to influence planning decisions; involve the public early and continuously; seek participation from a broad range of stakeholders; use different techniques to give and receive information from citizens and provide opportunities for dialogue and provide more information in a clearly understood form, free from distortion and technical jargon.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the research design and methodology used for this study. It starts by explaining the case study methodology and its relevance in addressing the research question. The justification for selecting Rethink London as a case study is then outlined. Rethink London was implemented within the context of Ontario’s land-planning framework, which provides the statutory basis for official plan reviews. The assessment methodology was drawn from case studies from British Columbia, where collaborative planning has been implemented. The assessment framework was then operationalised through interviews and documentary analysis. The chapter ends by discussing the methodological limitations and solution proffered.

3.1. Case study methodology

The methodological approach chosen for any piece of research is designed to provide proper data to answer the research question. There are many research strategies that may be used to collect and analyse empirical evidence (Yin, 2003a): experiment; survey; historical analysis; archival analysis; and case study. From these, a case study approach was selected as the best means of answering the question on the extent to which collaborative planning has been operationalised during Rethink London. Many other researchers who have studied collaborative planning processes have also used case study as their research methodology (see table 1). The research uses a case study to investigate complex issues balancing power dynamics, dealing with multiple and conflicting interests. A case study approach can also give the researcher a good opportunity to look at the holistic and meaningful features of complex social events by dealing with many pieces of evidence through various research methods (Hammersley, 2004; Yin, 2003a). The present case
study largely draws on qualitative research methods such as key informant interviews and documentary analysis.

Table 1: Use of case study as a research strategy by other researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Purpose of the Study</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margerum (2002)</td>
<td>To evaluate the collaborative planning process of a growth management case study in the state of Queensland, Australia (SEQ 2001).</td>
<td>Case Study, Documentary Analysis, Key Informant Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holvandus (2014)</td>
<td>To provide a viewpoint of neighbourhood associations in the collaborative planning process in Tallinn, Estonia</td>
<td>Case Study, Documentary analysis, Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton (2009)</td>
<td>To evaluate Collaborative Planning using a Case Study of the Morice Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP), British Columbia</td>
<td>Case Study, Survey, Key informant interviews, Documentary Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Justification of case selection

Rethink London was selected as a case study based on its unique characteristics as a planning project. First, it was a complex planning process characterised by different interests, values and priorities from those who were participating directly. This makes it an interesting case to test the ideas and principles of collaborative planning. Second, because of its innovations in participatory planning, Rethink London has been described as the best case on participatory planning in Canada. However, since the process was completed there has not been any academic studies conducted to test some of these claims using a comprehensive framework.
3.3. Land-use planning framework in Ontario Province

It is important to understand how the land-use planning system in Ontario works. This helps in situating the study in an appropriate context. The Ontario Planning Act is the main law governing land use planning in Ontario (Environment Commissioner of Ontario, 2011). The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) is a key component of Ontario’s land use planning system. The PPS establishes the policy framework to provide direction for municipalities on planning matters related to land use planning and development that are of provincial interest. The Planning Act requires municipalities to update their official plans every five years to ensure that they are consistent with the PPS (Ministry of Municipal Affairs, 2014).

Rethink London was guided by the provisions of the Planning Act and Provincial guidelines on issues such as public and stakeholder participation. The mechanisms for this involvement include accessing information made available to the public by municipalities; attending public meetings, attending open house information sessions; providing written comments; and, speaking at public meetings (Ministry of Municipal Affairs, 2014). The Planning Act also stipulates that where there are Aboriginal interests, it is important for municipalities to engage with Aboriginal communities as part of the land use planning process. However, people do not always agree on land-use planning matters. As such, the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) is an important institution in Ontario’s land-use planning system. It exists as an independent tribunal to hear appeals and make decisions on a variety of municipal land use planning matters that arise from conflicts associated with planning processes.

---

2An official plan is meant to manage and direct physical change and the effects on the social, economic, built and natural environment of the municipality or part of it.
3.4. A brief overview of the research context

London, Ontario, is located approximately halfway between Detroit, Michigan, and Toronto, Ontario, in the County of Middlesex (Arku et al, 2011). London is Canada’s 10th largest city and the 4th largest city in Ontario. Statistics Canada reported in the 2016 Census release that the city’s population was 383,822, representing a 4.8% change from 2011 (366,151). Based on growth projects over a 20-year period, the City of London’s population is expected to grow by 77,350 persons to approximately 443,500 by 2031 (City of London, 2011). The projected population growth will lead to increased housing demand in London. In total, the City is expected to require the addition of 42,380 new units over the 2011-2031 projection period.

London is a single-tier, ward-based municipal government with 14 councillors. Each member of the council must sit on one of the council’s three standing committees, which include the Planning Committee, Environment and Transportation Committee, and Community and Protective Services (Arku et al, 2011:150).

London continues to face significant planning problems. For example, the issue of urban sprawl has been a subject of debate for many years. Of late, the transportation and mobility particularly the issue bus rapid transit has attracted a lot of interest from environmental activists, the development industry, interest groups and other actors. These are some of the issues that triggered the City of London to ‘rethink’ its urban planning with the hope of creating sustainable urban development. For example, urban sprawl affects the ability of the city to provide for infrastructure and services (Richmond, 2014). Beginning 2011, London started the process of ‘rethinking’ its development planning by initiating a community-based approach to the review of its official plan.

---

3 The 20-year period is based on the Rethink London land needs background study (2011-2031)
3.5. The London Plan-making process-Rethink London

The objectives of Rethink London were to: engage the London community to collaboratively develop a shared vision for urban growth and development; ensure that there are diverse opportunities for local municipalities, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, institutions, businesses, community groups/associations, residents, and youth to become engaged in the planning process; educate the community about the importance of planning, create a shared sense of ownership and community pride for the city and engage the “unusual suspects” or those who don’t normally participate in planning (Rethink London Community Engagement Plan, 2012). Rethink London was also guided by principles as a process of meaningful two-way dialogue and participation in forming decisions that affect the community. These principles include: mutual respect and inclusion⁴, accessibility⁵, shared responsibility⁶, realistic expectations⁷; responsiveness⁸, and transparency⁹ (Rethink London community engagement plan, 2012).

After the launch of Rethink London on May 3rd, 2012, the City hosted ‘Discover your City’ session which was attended by more than 300 people. This was then followed by a visioning session on the 23rd of June 2012, which was attended by more than 350 people. The purpose of this session was to give Londoners an opportunity to define the type of city that they would want in the future

---

⁴ where all participants will listen and respect different opinions, be flexible in how the city interact and be open to considering alternatives; ⁵ where information and communications are easy to find, access and understand ⁶ where both the City and the community have responsibilities to fulfill in honouring the implementation of Rethink London and endeavour to meet these responsibilities ⁷ where at each level of engagement, all participants will understand their roles, responsibilities and authority and will understand that the interest of the community may be greater than the interest of individuals ⁸ where all participants will listen and respond to concerns in a timely manner, ensuring that outcomes and next steps are communicated ⁹ where all processes will be open, understandable, transparent and inclusive
Two identical workshops were held where participants were asked to think big about defining the future of their city. Session participants worked with one another to develop and prioritize goals and strategies that will help to achieve the vision. There were also various consultations done with representatives of the development community (see appendices 6 and 7). The input from visioning sessions, consultations and other engagement strategies was used to prepare discussion papers covering themes such as transportation, building strong neighbourhoods, connecting the region, making wise planning decisions, building a greener city, building a mixed use-compact city and creating a culturally rich and diverse city. These discussion papers together with stakeholder input were used in drafting the London plan, which was adopted by council and approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs on December 30, 2016.

3.6. Empirical case studies on measuring collaborative planning

The cases from British Columbia demonstrate circumstances where CP has been applied using stakeholder tables with representatives from regional and district resource management agencies, industry, labor, First Nations, environmental organizations, and the public. These stakeholder tables use consensus-based negotiations to prepare plans that are then submitted to the provincial government for approval (Cullen et al, 2010). The unprecedented experience of BC in applying collaborative planning to prepare land use plans for its entire land base generate useful insights on how to assess land-use planning processes from a CP perspective (Frame et al, 2004).

3.6.1. Case Study 1: Evaluating the Great Bear Rainforest land-use planning process

The Great Bear Rainforest land use decision was developed out of two separate but similar land-use planning processes: the Central Coast LRMP and the North Coast LRMP. In the first phase of the Central Coast LRMP (1996-2001), a planning table was created representing all stakeholders
including First Nations, government, resource industries, and conservationists. The second phase saw the creation of a new structure to accommodate the two distinct groups of participants: First Nations with special aboriginal rights, and other stakeholders. The North Coast process commenced in February 2002, reached consensus agreement in 2005, and was announced jointly with the Central Coast plan in 2006 as the GBRF planning decision (BC Government, 2006).

The evaluation criteria applied in this case study used the methodology that the authors developed and previously used to evaluate the LRMP process in British Columbia (Cullen et al, 2010). The authors used 14 process criteria, which were based on best practices for managing collaborative processes. The following process criteria were used for evaluating the GBRF collaborative planning process: purpose and incentives, inclusive representation, voluntary participation and commitment, self design, clear ground rules, equal opportunity and resources, principled negotiation and respect, accountability, flexible, adaptive, and creative, high quality information, time limits, implementation and monitoring, effective process management, and independent (Cullen et al, 2010: 340).

The data for the evaluation was collected through a survey sent to 36 respondents from the two planning tables. Most respondents agreed that all process criteria were met, and 10 of 14 process criteria had more than two-thirds agreement. The process criteria with less than two-thirds agreement were: inclusive representation, equal opportunity and resources, high-quality information, accountability, and commitment to implementation10 (Cullen et al, 2010: 344).

---

10 See appendix 1 for description of the CP process criteria
3.6.2. Case Study 2: The Morice Land and Resource Management Plan Process

Stakeholders in the Morice region successfully produced a consensus agreement for land use management after 18 months of negotiation. During the inception of the process in 2002, the Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management (MSRM) stated that the purpose of the Morice LRMP is to:

*enhance sustainable economic development in a way that balances competing uses and values and sustains environmental values by establishing a comprehensive and balanced land use vision, including land use zoning and management direction for a full range of resource values* (BC MSRM, 2002a: 2).

The LRMP process was an opportunity for interested stakeholders, the Province, First Nations and other levels of government to negotiate recommendations on land use and resource management (Morton, 2009). Morton used the same process criteria developed used by Cullen et al (2010). Survey was data collected through questionnaires emailed to 27 of the 38 possible table representatives and their alternates, including 21 sector representatives. The Morice LRMP performed well in meeting most of the criteria, with concerns raised about limited opportunities for First Nations participation and significant value differences among the parties making it difficult to achieve a shared purpose.

3.7. Assessment Framework adopted for this Study

Based on the literature review and case studies presented above, this paper adopts and modifies a framework by Frame (2002). This framework has been successfully operationalized by in the two BC case studies. Those factors which are most relevant to Rethink London were used. The selection of the factors was informed by the review of secondary material. The factors used include
equal opportunities and resources, purpose and incentives, accountability, high quality information, self design, clear ground rules, principled negotiation and respect, inclusive representation, voluntary participation and commitment, independent facilitation and effective process management (see appendix 1 for description of these factors).

However, it is important to note that the usability of any evaluation or assessment methodology largely depends on the context of a specific project. Although the BC case studies do not involve official plans in an absolute sense, there are significant insights that are relevant to the Rethink London case study in terms of methodology. The BC land-use planning processes were characterized by significant value differences and multiple interests as was the case with Rethink London. Just like Rethink London, the processes were also complex in scope. The assessment framework for this study was operationalized into concrete interview questions and used to collect data from selected respondents that were involved in the planning process (see appendices 4 and 5).

3.8. Research process and methods of data collection

The empirical data for this study was drawn from secondary documents and interview transcripts. Before the study was conducted, an application was prepared and submitted to the office of Human Research Ethics at Western University. The process happened in conjunction with the review of secondary documents.

3.8.1. Document review

To develop an understanding of the case study, various secondary documents were reviewed. These include official decision-making documents, staff reports, discussion papers, engagement plans, survey summaries, terms of reference and any other relevant background material. The
review of secondary documents formed the basis for developing the semi-structured key informant interview guides used for collecting primary data. It helped identify information gaps and issues that needed further confirmation from the participants themselves.

3.8.2. Semi-structured interviews

Email invitations were sent out to representatives of stakeholder groups that were participating in Rethink London (see appendix 2 for study email script). Semi-structured interviews were conducted with representatives of the Rethink London stakeholder groups including municipal officials (2), local political leaders (2), public engagement consultant (1), community leaders (3). The participants were selected based on their involvement in the Rethink London planning process and were able to offer first hand perspectives on the topic under study. Community leaders are highly active in civic participation in London, with some of them acting as leaders of neighbourhood associations or community groups. Interviewees were requested to sign the content form seeking their permission for recording and using the information (see appendix 3 for details). The interviews lasted between 45 minutes and 1 hour. Recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim and data analysed using thematic analysis, guided by the assessment framework.

3.9. Methodological Limitations

This assessment is based only on the views of those who participated in the process. They may be biased towards a more positive view because they invested in the process and had responsibility for the results, especially municipal officials. The views of other stakeholders who did not participate and the public are not included in the assessment. The exclusion of the general public was mainly because it was difficult to get information on who participated due to issues of privacy and confidentiality, which are highly respected in Canadian public institutions. Even if the data on
members of the public was available, it would be hard to determine a representative sample on such as complex planning exercise that took place over a 2-year period. There was no confirmation of participation from representatives of the development industry, First Nations and private sector planning consultancies. Primary data was triangulated with secondary data. A content analysis of the developers’ appeal letters was conducted to determine which policies of the plan were being challenged.
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter presents the research findings based on the interviews and documentary analysis. The results are explained following the criterion-based framework discussed earlier in this paper (see chapter 3). It starts by outlining the evidence that indicate whether Rethink London was driven by a shared purpose or not, which forms the foundation to outline results related to other variables such as inclusive presentation, equal opportunity and resources, high quality information, principled negotiation among others.

4.1. Purpose and Incentives

As a complex planning process, Rethink London was characterised by many divergent interests and values from those what were interested in the issues. One of the goals of the process was to collaboratively engage the London community to create a shared vision for urban growth and development. However, each stakeholder group had their own priorities, values and interests, making it difficult to achieve a shared purpose. For example, developers were advancing positions that were not consistent with the interests of the City such as a spread pattern of urban growth since most of them own properties outside the city’s Urban Growth Boundary (Interview with local political leader 11). A documentary review of some of the appeal letters submitted to the OMB confirms the difference in priorities. For example, in an appeal letter dated 18 November 2014, Auburn developments argues that ‘it appears the policies within this initial draft plan have been derived from a city departmental perspective and therefore lack the balance of development industry perspective and needs’. This was confirmed by local political leader 1 who stated that there were some conflicts because along the way some stakeholder groups like developers felt that

11 See appendix 8 for interview details
their concerns were not being heard. Developers were expressing concerns with shifts in policy, where the focus is on intensification within transportation corridors and nodes as well as provision of green spaces. On the other hand, consensus of the Londoners/members of the public who joined Rethink London was that the city needs to build up more than out, offer better public transit and other ways to get around, enhance and protect natural heritage and culture, and follow sensible planning rules (Richmond, 2013). The City of London was also pushing the agenda of intensification and infill developments to contain urban sprawl and reduce the cost of infrastructure development (interview with community leader 212). For environmental activists, their priority was also to fight against urban sprawl and protect green spaces (interview with community leader 113).

Summing up the issue of purpose, one interview participant had this to say,

“Does the document reflect the same vision that everyone would sign to? Obviously not otherwise the developers wouldn’t be appealing various section of the plan” (interview with community leader 1).

The participation of interview was driven by several factors. Community groups or neighbourhood associations were motivated since they believed that a land-use plan has significant impact on local communities, hence the need for the City to collaborate with resident groups in reviewing its official plan. The policies that were to come out of the Rethink London would have a neighbourhood impact, including impacts on the natural environment (interview with community leader 1).

12 See appendix 8
13 See appendix 8 for information
This was supported by another participant:

“\textit{How the city staff and elected officials make decisions have very profound or long-lasting impact on citizens in terms of how we experience the city and the relationships we make to places}” (interview with community leader 3).

These sentiments mean that when participants joined Rethink London, they had clear goals on why they were participating and what their involvement meant to them. They appreciated the usefulness of a land-use plan in guiding the development of the city.

\subsection*{4.2. Inclusive Representation}

One of the principles of Rethink London was to ensure that the process was inclusive. This was achieved using an appropriate mix of methods of participation. For example, the extensive use of social media was meant to attract young people get engaged in the planning process (interview with municipal official 1\textsuperscript{14}). There were also other methods of participation specifically designed to engage young people. These include in-school presentations, creative arts contests, hands-on visioning workshops and a special section dedicated to youth on Rethink London website. Community cafes were designed for in-depth discussion and feedback from community groups. These were set up to accommodate the needs of certain groups such as ethnic groups, mothers, seniors. By so doing, it was possible to engage the ‘hard to reach groups’ in places that were convenient for them (interview with municipal official 2). Figure 1 provides a snapshot of the proportion of participants that used the different methods of participation.

\textsuperscript{14}See appendix 8 for details
Figure 1 shows the proportion of participants that got engaged using different methods.

City of London (2013)

The mix of methods of participation shows commitment towards targeted engagement as one of the interviewees said,

“I think that was part of the targeted engagement that we were using, not just using the traditional public meetings and hearing out whatever comments come in. But identifying specific groups that we wanted to hear from including the youth, seniors, First Nations, the development industry and then tailor these methods appropriately” (interview with municipal official 1).

In terms of numbers, Lura consulting\textsuperscript{15} reported that over the course of Rethink London, almost 17,000 Londoners were engaged in the city building conversations, with exposure to over 240,000 people. These individuals represent all generations, diverse cultural communities and all socio-economic classes, as well as a variety of businesses, agencies and other stakeholders. However,

\textsuperscript{15} Lura consulting is a community engagement consulting company based in Toronto, which was hired to design Rethink London’s public engagement strategy.
data on members of the public was not disaggregated into gender, ethnic status and other socio-economic characteristics (Interview with public engagement consultant). It is thus difficult to determine the representativeness of the more than 15,000 people who directly participated in the Rethink London in terms of their socio-economic and demographic characteristics.

First Nations Communities do not always get opportunities to participate in decision making process. There appears to be only one Policy within the entire document that speaks to First Nations interests. There were also concerns with regards to exclusion of other socially disadvantaged groups such as the homeless (interview with community leader 2).

4.3. Voluntary Participation and Commitment

There is evidence of genuine commitment to the success of Rethink London. One of the local political leaders said,

“I have been the President of the Urban League of London for many years. I have also served on the City’s Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee, which provides technical advice on environmental matters that are relevant to official plans. Between 2011 and 2012, I was involved with Rethink London community working groups, attended majority of the planning sessions” (interview with local political leader).

This statement indicates that the interviewee was dedicated to offer his technical know-how and community experience even at a volunteer basis. From an administrative point of view, municipal officials who were co-leading the planning process were also committed to make it successful. By the end of Rethink London, stakeholders had contributed thousands of hours through attending public meetings, providing feedback, drafting discussion papers. Residents or members of the public provided a lot of comments to improve the whole planning processes. Participants were also
engaging voluntarily and there were cases of participants pulling out of the process (interview with municipal official 1). This may be partly because of the different engagement methods were used to address people who were likely to have different levels of interest and ability to participate. For example, those who were not interested in public meetings would use the workshop in a box technique or community asset mapping to remain committed in the planning process.

4.4. Self Design

When Rethink London was designed, there were submissions that were made by representatives of stakeholder groups in terms what they wanted the process to focus on. For example, community groups submitted to the City Council arguing that the input of local citizens should be valued as this will truly make London the ‘City of Opportunity” and a place of healthy and safe neighbourhoods in which to work, play, worship and grow (City of London, 2012). For example, the Southeast London community council submitted that there was need for the voice of all Londoners to be heard and represented to facilitate a collaborative approach in the planning process. However, a review of the submissions made did not show how First Nations were involved in the design of the process.

4.5. Clear Ground Rules

The Rethink London planning process had clearly laid out Terms of Reference (TORs), which were developed and adopted in 2012. The TORs were developed in consultation with other stakeholder groups including community organizations, non-governmental organisations, private sector planning consultants, development industry among others. The City also established working groups along different ‘interest streams’-community working group, development industry working group and provincial/agency/area municipalities working group. The working
groups had the following responsibilities: review information from the related background Studies; review input from the community consultation process and identify key issues and priorities arising from them; assist with developing the vision for the City, including strategic directions and key initiatives; evaluate alternative strategies for the resolution of identified issues; and provide input and review discussion papers. However, one thing which did not come out clearly is how the working groups interacted with Rethink London reporting structures including the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee and the Planning and Environment Committee. It was highlighted that the TORs were not entirely adhered to during the planning process (interview with municipal official 2, interview with community leader 1). The stakeholders did not have an opportunity to reflect on whether the TORs or ground rules were still relevant or adhered to. There were also no clear rules/mechanisms for dispute resolution during the planning process (interview with municipal official 1).

4.6. Equal Opportunity and Resources

Some of the discussions on Rethink London focused on the technical aspects of planning including issues of urban growth pattern (compact, spread or hybrid scenarios), transport and mobility, city prosperity and other city building themes. However, there were significant knowledge differences among the participants. One of the interviewees had this to say:

“The planning team did not invest much in training and education to build the capacities of participants, especially those with limited understanding of planning matters. The developers and private consultants had a better understanding of the implications of the different proposals and what they mean for their own interests in the City. On the other hand, most of the ordinary residents did not have prior knowledge on planning and that
might have affected the quality of their contributions as well as limiting opportunities for questioning some of the planning ideas (interview with community leader 1)

To deal with the knowledge asymmetry, some of the methods of participation such as surveys were designed to be user friendly and distorted from technical jargon (interview with municipal official 1). A local political leader confirmed municipal staff were able to customize some of the information content, communication methods and framing questions to suit the stakeholders’ differing capacities and frames of reference.

Power imbalances were also evident in the process. A London resident quoted in the London free press describes these dynamics as follows:

“Londoners who believed in our democratic right to voice our input and concerns when we attended Rethink meetings on London’s future development planning are being dishonoured. Greedy developers and the OMB appeal process are rejecting the collective agreement of the citizens who conscientiously sat through presentations and proactively voiced our concerns and suggestions. They are making a mockery of our efforts. We are being ignored by this capitalistic decision to silence our voices, by hungry developers swallowing up all green and open spaces left in London, so their pockets will be full of our taxpayer dollars. Democracy has a new meaning: money talks (Letter to the editor, London free press, 02/02/2017).

Developers in London such as the London Development Institute are more powerful, and they exert much control on decisions relating to city building in London. They own large plots of land in the city and have adequate resources to navigate through the complex planning appeal processes.
4.7. Principled Negotiation and Respect

Under Collaborative Planning, stakeholders value other perspectives. This means that they listen and search for probable meeting points arising out of different discourses. Every stakeholder has a voice and ear (Ledwith, 1997). However, each participant brings a set of individual attitudes, values, interests, and knowledge in addition to the cultures, missions, and mandates of the organizations or constituents they represent (Bardach, 2001). This makes principled negotiation and respect important in CP processes. Though the process managed to promote open communication and teamwork, especially among the community groups, there were limited opportunities to bring the different participants and stakeholders under roof to discuss planning ideas. One of the interviewees had this to say,

“A lot of the developers were not interested in joining with ordinary people at the public meetings. I rarely saw any developers at the meetings at least the once I attended. The development community were not engaged at the same level as the ordinary Londoners. I wanted them to sit down with us and listen to the ideas and be sure that they are buying into the ideas (interview with community leader 3).

The very diversity of participation forms that ensured that people were engaged in “appropriate” ways paradoxically also created the silo effect. This implies that there may be some tough trade-offs in large-scale collaborative planning. By engaging stakeholders in silos, it was impossible to hear some of the divergent views and identify meeting points to build consensus.
4.8. Accountability

Rethink London was accountable to the participants by communicating and engaging them through mechanisms such as newsletters, open houses and workshops. This increased the probability that participants understood how decisions were taken, and how their interests were incorporated into the London plan. The City staff also prepared discussion papers and survey summaries outlining what participants would have said with regards to issues of housing, transport, economy, urban growth, environmental sustainability among other issues. An issue/response database was set up to maintain a list of all issues that were raised by the stakeholders and how they have been addressed/responded to in the planning process. Local elected officials were relevant in making the process accountable. For example, the reporting structures and accountability frameworks required planning staff to report to Council and Committees on public participation. This reduced the potential to undermine democratic processes.

4.9. High Quality Information

The use of innovative and diverse methods of participation resulted in high quality information being produced for creative decision making. For example, the use of online idea and concurrent idea generation station allowed people to brainstorm and submit redevelopment ideas for specific sites. Ideas could be located on a map and discussed and rated by other participants. Local political leader 1 reiterated that discussions on specific policy themes provided useful and adequate information. For example, on urban growth patterns the planning staff were able to make cost projections on the three scenarios-compact, spread and hybrid model. The implications of these scenarios on tax revenue was clearly explained to participants. Background and discussion papers were extensively publicised and presented to stakeholders.
Although information was provided in a timely manner, there were some cases of information asymmetry, particularly in relation to issues around the policy changes from the previous official plan. The Rethink London process and the subsequent London plan represents a change of policy from the previous Official Plan. Community leader 1 pointed out that:

“They did not explain clearly to people the implications of changing certain policies.

Personally, I don’t think the process was set up to provide the details.

4.10. Independent facilitation and effective process management

As planners carry many often-simultaneous roles when leading the planning process, the question arises whether the role of a facilitator should be one of them (see Innes and Booher, 2004; Ansell and Gash, 2008). The primary role of the administrator in a participatory democracy is to act as a teacher and guide to facilitate social learning and public deliberation. Those interviewed indicated that very few of the public meetings were facilitated by an external party. City staff were the ones that mainly facilitated most of the meetings which participants attended. The problem is that internal staff are rarely neutral about their own work (Innes and Booher, 1999). One of respondents stated that it would have made a difference if the City engaged some people from the community groups to co-facilitate the discussions. All the CP factors outlined in this chapter are connected to each other. The focus of the next chapter is to discuss and analyse these findings in a more integrated way and relate them back to CP literature.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents an integrated analysis of the assessment framework as applied to the Rethink London case study. It also examines the applicability of this framework to complex planning projects. The research findings are also compared with literature on CP strengths and challenges as some of them are connected to the assessment factors used.

5.1. Integrated analysis of the CP framework as applied to Rethink London

As argued in this paper, there is no “one-size-fits-all” framework for assessing land-use planning processes from a CP perspective. Each project and context are unique. Nevertheless, the assessment framework used in this study was applicable to the Rethink London case study. For a complex project, there might be trade offs with some of the factors discussed in this paper.

Rethink London exemplifies features of the CP framework, which is made of pre-negotiation, negotiation and post-negotiation stages (Gunton and Day, 2003). During pre-negotiation, stakeholders are identified and recruited. During the preparatory phase of Rethink London, the city managed to identify representatives of key stakeholders including community groups, development industry, non-governmental organisations, government organisations among others. These were recruited to design the process and contribute to the drafting of the TORs. However, it seems there was no effective conflict assessment to determine areas of conflict and the possibilities of reaching a consensus. Understanding the stakeholders helps in the selection of appropriate methods of participation that meets the needs of different groups for inclusive representation. Rethink London was very effective in this regard. The methods were designed to engage the unusual suspects, hard to reach groups, young people, seniors, the usual suspects among others.
The results of this study also resonate with the CP literature on strengths and challenges. There is a link between high quality information, inclusive representation and innovative, high quality decisions. One of the interviewees stated that those who do the planning do not always have the answers (interview with community leader 3). This is supported by another participant who said:

“The man on the street has a lot to offer. His ideas might not always be better but are different; they give different perspective. Bringing a lot of different people together allows new ideas to develop” (Engagement participant quoted in the Rethink London playbook).

These insights are consistent with debates raised in literature (see chapter two). Brabham (2009) argues that non-expert knowledge from members of the public is critical in generating innovative ideas to map out planning decisions. For Van Herzele (2004), the inclusion of the perspectives of individuals outside of the professional context of planning can (re)discover creative solutions that can work in an explicit local context. Under Rethink London, the mix of traditional and innovative participation approaches was intended to engage a diverse group of stakeholders as well as getting useful information for planning purposes. For example, the use of location-based surveys offered useful information on issues such as preferred urban design alternatives leading to innovative planning solutions that were applicable within a local context.

The fact that there were significant power differences between the development community and other participants including members of the public resonates with the arguments that have been raised in literature. Ideally, collaborative planning addresses power imbalances between the planners and stakeholders by shifting decision making authority to stakeholders. However, not all participants come to the negotiating table equal (Susskind et al., 2003; Gunton and Day, 2003; Cullen et al, 2010; Cornwall, 2003). Powerful stakeholders have the potential to easily manipulate the process to their own advantage. In London like any other Ontario municipality, residents and
ratepayer organizations often lack the resources and specialized knowledge necessary to navigate the complex planning process. Development industry stakeholders have the resources, knowledge and experience to skillfully argue their case before the OMB for example.

The complexity of the planning exercise makes it difficult to satisfy all the ideals and principles of collaborative planning. In a city wide official plan review process, the many ‘stakes’ and complexity can make it difficult to work towards the same purpose. What transpired during Rethink London is what Loorbach (2010:164) describes as, ‘complex problems rooted in different social domains, occurring at varying levels and involving various actors with dissimilar perspectives, norms and values’. In such circumstances, it might also be challenging to have principled negotiation and respect among the different stakeholder groups. Innes and Booher (2010) argues that in complex processes, is it very difficult to minimise issues such as attempts to control decision making and shape agendas.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. Concluding Remarks

The focus of the research question was to examine the extent to which Rethink London exemplifies the tenets of collaborative planning. Despite the complexity of the planning exercise, the evidence presented in this paper suggests that Rethink London was a relatively successful CP process. Opportunities were created to involve a diverse group of participants, including the unusual suspects and the hard to reach communities. This was achieved through an appropriate mix of methods of participation including extensive community outreach, kitchen table discussions, places and spaces conversations. While the assessment of Rethink London indicates that problems of power and equity were not significant enough to render the process unsuccessful, some concerns about power imbalances were highlighted by the interview respondents. Challenges around the participation of First Nations and other marginalised groups like the homeless also raised questions that might support radical critiques of CP. Nevertheless, Rethink London performed well in fulfilling some of the main principles of collaborative planning. It is important to note that in large scale planning projects, there are always trade-offs between engaging stakeholders in ways that work for them and getting everyone around the same table. Access to resources, especially knowledge on planning matters is always a major issue in collaborative planning processes. The need for competence in exchanging information as well as in participation is important. Representativeness is hard to achieve, but at least the information produced in participation should help in recognizing and understanding the variety of views.

The discussion joins a long inventory of CP studies that documents the benefits of CP relative to technocratic planning. In practice, technocratic approaches are still prevalent in North America. Brunner and Steelman (2005), for example, emphasize that remnants of scientific management
remain entrenched in the current North American governance paradigm. As such, this study provides support for CP by highlighting the success of the Rethink London planning experience, which was based on a very deliberate, and large-scale move away from technocratic planning practice.

6.2. Recommendations

No CP process will ever be perfect. While Rethink London was successful overall, it experienced obstacles. The best that can be achieved is constant reflection and revision to translate lessons learned into process improvements. Every process is different, and a myriad of context-specific factors contribute to success or failure, many of which are beyond the control of managers. Therefore, recommendations must be taken in context and treated as tools for learning, not as recipes for success. Collaborative planning is a complex tool with strengths as well as challenges. It requires careful attention to detail and design from the process managers to tease out the best benefits and minimise negative effects. The paper makes the following recommendations:

As part of the preliminary work, more could have been done to allow stakeholders to set the purpose of the process, including setting clear ground rules. Unfortunately, flexibility was lost as Rethink London progressed as there was no opportunity for participants to reflect on whether the process was progressing as planned or was there need for adjustment. In addition, providing representatives with the opportunity to periodically assess and adjust their process design would have increased their sense of ownership.

Collaborative planning must also be done as an iterative process, especially in the context of large scale planning projects. It might be useful to start the process with the unusual suspects and do incremental improvements. This might also include continuous engagement of aboriginal
communities to build relationships, share information and find common interests related to land use planning.

The local government must invest more in training and education to build the capacity of participants especially on questions that are highly technical. It is important for practitioners to prioritize participant training in consensus decision-making and negotiation. This will ensure that all parties have the opportunity and resources to participate effectively in the decision-making process (Frame, 2002). Training in a large-scale project can be done using community leaders who can act as trainers in their own communities.

In terms of designing the process, the working groups would have been structured as thematic ‘collaboratives’ covering areas such as housing, transportation, city prosperity and economy, environmental management, culture and heritage, diversity. Stakeholders will then be invited to participate in one or more of the ‘collaboratives’ to build consensus on cross-cutting issues.

As it became apparent from the analysis and discussion, everyone who does not, for some reason, receive information is basically left out of the process. This is consequently tied to the fact that current planning legislation in Ontario does not define how the planning process should be carried out and in what ways or how different stakeholders should be included and informed, nor does it explain how to arrange discussions. At the same time, in the name of more productive planning processes, local government as the initiator of the planning process should invest more in thinking through ways for different stakeholders to be informed and involved or demand this action from the ones this assignment has been delegated to, e.g. the planners or consultants. Furthermore, the possible check-list of stakeholders, even if only preliminary, should be adequately informed and engaged in the preparation of terms of reference to initiate planning, which in the long run might reduce conflicts during the planning process.
6.3. Areas for further research

The study has applied a CP framework to assess Rethink London. Future studies can possibly use a different framework and see if the results would be different. Comparative studies can also be done with other official planning processes in Ontario municipalities to test the applicability of this framework in different local government settings.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Assessment Framework adopted for this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose and Incentives</strong></td>
<td>The collaborative process is driven by a shared purpose, whereby all stakeholders involved believe that the process will produce the best solution available, relative to other available processes. Stakeholders negotiate in good faith with a goal of reaching consensus agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive Representation</strong></td>
<td>Representation is inclusive if the following parties are involved: those directing affected by or with a significant interest in the agreement, those necessary to implement the agreement, those that may challenge or destabilize the final agreement, especially non-activist and nonaligned members of the public, and the relevant government authorities. Coalitions may be sought when interests between stakeholder groups are comparable, to maintain a manageable table size and avoid overlapping representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary Participation &amp; Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders are participating in the process of their own volition and have a genuine commitment to the process. No stakeholder is required to remain involved in the process if they feel that the process is not serving them adequately. This helps to ensure that table members respect each other and attempt to incorporate all interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Design</strong></td>
<td>Flexibility allows participants to design a process and institute the ground rules and objectives that best suit the circumstances of the particular group. All table members are given an equal opportunity to involve themselves in the design process. Mediators and facilitators may propose design options, although the final decisions over design are left to the table members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear Ground Rules</strong></td>
<td>Ground rules are created, and a Terms of Reference is developed that addresses the scope and mandate of the process, the roles and responsibilities of participants, a code of conduct for interaction between participants, a clear description of the term ‘consensus’, a defined method for resolving disputes, the use of sub-groups, and a strategy for media and outreach. Rules should allow for flexibility and adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Opportunity and Resources</strong></td>
<td>Every table member is able to participate effectively throughout the process. To ensure that all parties have the opportunity and resources to participate, training in consensus decision-making and negotiation are offered to participants, as well as access to any information relevant to the decision-making process. Finally, adequate resources should be available to all participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principled Negotiation and Respect</strong></td>
<td>Diverse interests, values, and knowledge of all stakeholders are respected. Principled negotiation and respect allow for participants to learn from the diversity of knowledge and interests at the stakeholder table. This type of dialogue also encourages trust and honesty and promotes interest-based negotiation rather than positional bargaining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>Participants are held accountable to the collaborative process that they helped to design, and public outreach occurs to keep the public up to date on the process. This includes processes to confirm that the decisions of the stakeholder table are representative of the interests of the broader public, as well as the interests of those participating directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Quality Information</strong></td>
<td>Participants have adequate and accurate information that is given to them in a timely fashion. The information is presented in such a way as to be clear to all participants and is incorporated in the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Process Management</strong></td>
<td>Impartial process staff are useful in managing the process and ensuring that stakeholders do not suffer burnout. Effective process management will allow for: the management and execution of a process plan, coordination and communication, information management, meeting facilities, complete records of all meetings and decisions, and administrative support. Impartial, non-affiliated process staff may also perform a pre-negotiation assessment to ensure that all stakeholders are identified and that a collaborative process is appropriate given the circumstances of the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Facilitation</strong></td>
<td>The use of a neutral facilitator or mediator that all parties can agree on is useful to bring parties towards consensus. Trained facilitators ensure that all table members feel respected and secure. Facilitators also work to move parties away from positional bargaining and towards interest-based negotiation, and to create a balance of power among participants through equal opportunity to voice concerns and ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Frame (2002)
Appendix 2: Study recruitment email script

Dear [Insert name]

I would like to invite you to participate in a study that I am conducting. Briefly, the study focuses on the Rethink London, “a community engagement process that was used in the review of the City of London’s Official Plan. The study aims to assess the extent to which the Rethink London planning process exemplifies the tenets of collaborative planning, how inclusive the process was; the contributions and degree of influence of different actors among other themes.

I would like to conduct an interview with you, lasting 45 minutes to one hour, to discuss your insights on stakeholder participation during Rethink London. We can conduct the interview in person at a time and place that we mutually agree on, or – if preferable to you – over the phone.

I hope you will be willing and able to participate in this research. If you are interested in participating, please read the attached letter of information and then get in touch with me by e-mail or telephone so that we can arrange a time and place for the interview. I look forward to the prospect of speaking with you and hearing your knowledge and insights.

Thank you,

Elmond Bandauko, Graduate Student
Master of Public Administration (MPA)
Department of Political Science, University of Western Ontario
ebandauk@uwo.ca
226 504 8118

Supervisor: Professor Martin Horak
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science
University of Western Ontario
Tel: 519.661.2111 ext. 85002
Email: mhorak@uwo.ca

Appendix 3: Interview consent form

Study Title: Stakeholder Participation in Land-use planning processes: An assessment of Rethink London using the collaborative planning framework

I. I have read the information letter sent to me, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

II. I consent to the recording of this interview _________ (check here)
I do not consent to the recording of this interview _________ (check here)
III. I consent to being identified by my role in the final report (e.g., municipal official or stakeholder) ………… (check here)
   I do not consent to being identified by my role in the final report (e.g., municipal official or stakeholder) ………… (check here)

IV. I consent to the use of direct quotations in the final report… (check here)
   I do not consent to the use of direct quotations in the final report (check here)

V. I consent to the use of information provided for future academic work (check here)
   I do not consent to the use of information provided for future academic work (check here)

VI. I wish to be identified directly in dissemination of research findings (check here)
   I do not wish to be identified directly in dissemination of research findings (check here)

Interview Participant ……………
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[Do you feel Rethink was the best way to achieve your goals/ with respect to land-use planning?]
[Were the Rethink process participants collectively identified and agreed upon clear goals and objectives?]
[Do you think the issues you were dealing with in the Rethink process were significant problems requiring timely resolution?]

2. In your opinion, how effectively was the stakeholder engagement plan executed?
   a. Was there any pre-negotiation assessment conducted to identify stakeholders and their interests in the planning process?
   b. The planning process started by setting up interest based working groups, do you think this limited the opportunity for exchange of different views among the stakeholders and participants?
      [In your view, do you think the structuring of working groups based on interests was problematic?]
      [Did you ever bring the different groups of stakeholders on a dialogue table?]
      [If so, how effective was this approach in building consensus among the different stakeholders?]

Section B: Effectiveness of the Rethink London Planning Process

Inclusive Representation

3. I’d like us to discuss about your personal reflections of the Rethink London process
   a. How were participants for community meetings recruited?
      [Do you think the recruitment methods ensured equal and inclusive representation of participants?]
   b. One of the objectives of Rethink London process was to engage the “unusual suspects” or those who don’t normally participate in planning or city initiatives. Other people say that it is important to involve more people such as ‘hard-to-reach’ groups in the decision-making process
      • Was this an important objective in your view?
        [If so, why]
      • Who did you identify or define as hard-to-reach groups?
        [To what extent did Rethink engage these groups?]
        [Did you use different strategies to reach out to these groups?]
      • Overall, do you feel the objective of engaging ‘unusual suspects’ and ‘hard to reach’ groups was achieved?
        [If so, how & why]
        [Have you been satisfied with the extent of stakeholder collaboration on Rethink?]
        [Do you think all appropriate interests or values were represented in the planning process?]

Voluntary Participation and Commitment

4. To what extent, did Rethink London enhance voluntary participation of stakeholder groups?
   [Did you ever experience groups of stakeholders who pulled out of the process because they felt disenfranchised?]

Process Design

5. How was Rethink London planning process designed?
a. Did you engage any stakeholders or participants in designing the process?  
   [If so, who was involved & what were their contributions]
b. What informed your selection of engagement strategies and media strategy?

**Clear Ground Rules**

6. Did you have defined terms of reference for the Rethink London working groups?  
   a. How was the engagement between different actors/stakeholders structured?  
      [Were the engagement rules different for different groups of stakeholders?]

**Equal Opportunity and Resources**

7. Tell me about the resources provided to participants during Rethink Planning Process  
   a. Did you incorporate any training and education for participants in the process?  
      [If so, why kind of training]  
      • How did you decide what kind of training and education would be needed?  
      • Did it differ for different participants?  
      • Are you happy with the level / kind of training that you provided to participants?  
       [Do you think the training enhanced the participants’ abilities and skills to negotiate?]
8. To what extent did Rethink London reduce power imbalances among participants?

**High Quality Information**

9. Did you provide high quality scientific and social information to the planning table?  
   [How effective did you explain the evaluation of planning proposals and instruments to stakeholders and participants?]

**Principled Negotiation and Respect**

10. Did you ever have to step in and represent the point of view of a certain group of stakeholders because they were hard to reach or engage?  
    [What did you do when the preferences of different stakeholders on one issue were opposed?]  
    [How did you reconcile the differences?]
11. Did Rethink London process encourage open communication about participants’ interests?  
    [Did participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the different stakeholder interests around the negotiating table?]  
    [Did participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the different stakeholder interests around the table?]  
    [To what extent did Rethink foster teamwork among participants and or stakeholders?]

**Accountability**

12. How effective was the Rethink London in representing the interests of the broader public?  
    [How effective was the strategy for communicating with the broader public?].

**Effective Process Management**

13. Was the Rethink London process managed in a neutral and unbiased manner?  
    [To what extent were Process staff (including facilitator(s) if used) skilled in running meetings?]  
    [How well did the working groups work with the Committees-Planning &Environment, Strategic Priorities & Policy Committees]
Independent Facilitation

14. How were the public meetings and dialogue sessions facilitated?
   - [Did you ever use independent facilitators during engagement meetings?]
   - [If so, was there any training offered to facilitators?]
   - [How successful was the use of facilitators in the dialogue process?]

15. [For the Planning Team in the City of London]
   **In your professional experience on Rethink London how do you perceive your role(s) as a planner in a collaborative planning process?**
   - [For instance, do you see yourself as a facilitator, an advocate, an educator, etc. ?]
   - [In case of competing priorities/interests, how did you decide what should be incorporated into the plan?]
   - [How did you reconcile any differences between your own preferences and the preferences of the community during the Rethink London Process?]

Section C: General Questions and Comments

- What do you think were the most significant achievements of the Rethink London Planning Process?
- Comment on the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Planning Process?
- Do you think Rethink London best way of developing a land-use plan?
- What information was useful in developing the London Plan?
- What changes could have made Rethink London effective?
- Do you have any other comments on the Rethink London Planning Process?

Appendix 5: Key Informant Interview Guide for Representatives of Participating Stakeholders

Thank you for taking time and agreeing to participate in this study. Before we begin the interview, I would like to hand you a copy of the consent form for your signature, which affirms that you consent to this interview. I would also want to confirm if you are clear on how you will be identified in the research. With your permission, I would kindly request if you are OK with me recording our discussion. If you agree to recording, you can as well authorise that on the consent form. The interview is semi-structured, we will start with a general discussion on your involvement in the Rethink process, followed by a set of structured questions under specific themes. However, you are free to reflect on some of the important issues on the planning process.

Section A: Breaking the Ice- Purpose and Incentives

1. I’d like to start by talking a bit about how your organization, and you personally, were involved in the ReThink process.
   a. How did [your group/organization] first learn about ReThink?
   b. In what ways was [your organization] involved in the process?
   c. What role did you personally play in this involvement?
   d. Why did you get involved in the Rethink London planning process?
      - [Do you feel Rethink was the best way to achieve your goals/ with respect to land-use planning?]
[Were the Rethink process participants collectively identified and agreed upon clear goals and objectives?]  
[Do you think the issues you were dealing with in the Rethink process were significant problems requiring timely resolution?]

2. In your opinion, how effectively was the stakeholder engagement process executed?
   a. The planning process started by setting up interest-based working groups, do you think this limited the opportunity for exchange of different views among the stakeholders and participants?
   [Was your organization represented in any of the Rethink Working groups?]  
   [In your view, do you think the structuring of working groups based on interests was problematic?]  
   [Did you ever participate on a dialogue table with the different groups of stakeholders?]  
   [If so, how effective was this approach in building consensus among the different stakeholders?]

Section B: Effectiveness of the Rethink London Planning Process

Inclusive Representation

3. One of the objectives of Rethink London was to “engage the London community to collaboratively develop ReThink London and create a shared vision for urban growth and development”
   a. Do you think this was an important objective?
      [If so, why]
      [To what extent do you think this objective was achieved?]
      [Were you satisfied with the level of stakeholder representation during Rethink?]
      [Do you feel Rethink did enough to engage ordinary Londoners?]  
      [Maybe for Councillors]
      [Do you think all appropriate interests or values were represented in the planning process?]

Voluntary Participation and Commitment

4. To what extent, did Rethink London enhance voluntary participation of stakeholder groups?
   [Did you ever experience groups of stakeholders who pulled out of the process because they felt disenfranchised?]  
   [Would you say you and or your organisation were committed to make Rethink London work?]  
   [Do you think other stakeholders were committed to make the planning process work?]

Process Design

5. Did you or your organization get involved in the design of Rethink London planning process?
   [If so, how did you contribute to process design]
   [If no, what difference do you think your involvement would have made?]
   [On an ongoing basis, were you able to influence Rethink London planning process?]

Equal Opportunity and Resources

6. Tell me about the resources provided to you (and your organisation) during Rethink Planning Process
   a. Did you receive any training and education to participate effectively in the process?
      [If so, why kind of training]
      [Are you happy with the level / kind of training that you received?]  
      [Do you think the training enhanced your abilities and skills to negotiate?]
7. To what extent did Rethink London reduce power imbalances among the different participants?

High Quality Information
9. Did the planning team provide high quality scientific and social information to the planning table?  
   [How effectively did the planning team explain the evaluation of London plan proposals and instruments to stakeholders and participants?]

Principled Negotiation and Respect
10. Do you think your values [individual/organizational] and interests were respected during Rethink discussions?  
    [What did you do when the preferences and interests of your organisation were opposed?]  
    [Were you satisfied with how the issue was resolved?]
11. Did Rethink London process encourage open communication about participants’ interests?  
    [Did participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the different stakeholder interests around the negotiating table?]  
    [Did participants demonstrate a clear understanding of the different stakeholder interests around the planning table?]  
    [To what extent did Rethink foster teamwork among participants and or stakeholders?]

Accountability
12. How effective was the Rethink London in representing the interests of the broader public?  
    [Did Rethink London had an effective strategy for communicating with the broad range of stakeholders and participants?]
13. How did Rethink London help you in ensuring accountability to your constituency?  
    [Did the organization/sector/group you represented provided you with clear direction throughout the process?]

Effective Process Management
13. Was the Rethink London planning process managed in a neutral and unbiased manner?  
    [To what extent were Process staff (including facilitator(s) if used) skilled in running meetings?]  
    [How well did the working groups work with the Committees-Planning & Environment, Strategic Priorities & Policy Committees]

Independent Facilitation
14. How were the public meetings and dialogue sessions facilitated?  
    [Do you think the facilitation of dialogue sessions was effectively done?]  
    [To what extent did the facilitation managed power imbalances between the different participating stakeholder group?]  
    [Were independent facilitators ever used during in the dialogue sessions?]  
    [If so, how effective was the use of independent facilitators in promoting mutual dialogue?]

Section C: General Questions and Comments
- What do you think were the most significant achievements of the Rethink London Planning Process?
- Comment on the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Planning Process?
- Do you think Rethink London best way of developing a land -use plan?
[How satisfied were you that the plan was produced as a result of the process which incorporated your priorities?]
- What changes could have made Rethink London effective?
- Do you have any other comments on the Rethink London Planning Process?

### Appendix 6: Schedule of Consultations with development industry during Rethink London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Focus of the Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 23, 2013</td>
<td>Dinner Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 10, 2013</td>
<td>Meeting on LDI written submission on the discussion papers (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 30, 2014</td>
<td>Presentation on The London Plan (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 15, 2015</td>
<td>Meeting on the Natural Heritage policies of The London Plan (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 6, 2016</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss the nature of the changes to the Natural Heritage policies of the London Plan (recommended Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Area Planning Consultants (LAPC)</td>
<td>November 14, 2012</td>
<td>WIAB (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 16, 2013</td>
<td>1st Cut Plan outline (SG/HMcN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 4, 2014</td>
<td>Presentation on The London Plan (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Urban League of London</td>
<td>September 27, 2012</td>
<td>WIAB (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 29, 2014</td>
<td>Presentation on the London Plan to “Neighbourhood Groups” that form part of the Urban League (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 27, 2014</td>
<td>Presentation to the Urban League on the London Plan with a focus on the intensification policies of the Plan (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 1, 2015</td>
<td>Meeting with Urban League and Neighbourhood groups on the intensification policies of The London Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 11, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up meeting with Urban League and Neighbourhood groups on the intensification policies of The London Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Society of Architects:</td>
<td>October 20, 2014</td>
<td>Presentation on The London Plan (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London District Construction Association</td>
<td>November 19, 2014</td>
<td>Presentation on The London Plan (ReThink team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Consulting Engineers of Ontario/Western Engineering Students:</td>
<td>Jan. 17, 2013</td>
<td>Customized WIAB/Visual Preference Survey (ReThink Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London St. Thomas Real Estate Board:</td>
<td>June 4, 2015</td>
<td>Growth projections and housing forecast discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Joint Meetings with representatives of the development industry

- November 27, 2012 – WIAB/Visual Preference Survey (LDI/LHBA)
- August 21, 2013 – 1st Cut Plan outline (LDI/LHBA/LAPC – primary contacts)
- February 25, 2014 – ReThinking points (LDI/LHBA/LAPC – primary contacts)
- May 27, 2014 – The London Plan overview (LDI/LHBA/LAPC – primary contacts)
- June 16, 2014 - Presentation on The London Plan (LHBA/LSTAR/Chamber of Commerce)
- September 10, 2014 – Building and Development Liaison Forum
- October 29 & 30, 2014 and November 27, 2014 – Industry Workshops on The London Plan
  (LDI/LHBA/LAPC/LSTAR/LDCA/LCEO/LSA/Urban Design Peer Review Panel Urban League/Progress London)
- November 3, 2014 - Building and Development Liaison Forum
- December 8, 2014 – Workshop on Intensification Opportunities (LDI/LHBA/LAPC/LSA)
- January 14, 2015 - Building and Development Liaison Forum
- April 16, 2015 – Bonusing and Guideline Document discussion (LAPC/LDI)
- August 14, 2015 – Urban Growth Boundary and Intensification discussion (LDI/Urban League)
- September 18, 2015 – Industry Workshop on the second draft of The London Plan
  (LDI/LHBA/LAPC/LSTAR/LDCA/LCEO/LSA/Urban Design Peer Review Panel Urban League/Progress London)
- December 14, 2015 – Building & Development “Industry” session to discuss detailed comments on the second draft of The London Plan (LDI/LHBA/LAPC/LSTAR/LDCA/LCEO/LSA)
- January 15, 2016 – Brainstorm with LDI/LAPC on The London Plan Corridor policies
- February 26, 2016 – Followup meeting with LDI representatives on The London Plan Corridor & Transit Village policies
- April 6, 2016 – Follow up meeting with LDI (LAPC and LHBA were invited) to discuss the Natural Heritage policies
- March 2016 – separate one-on-one meetings with industry/development landowners (6)

Appendix 6: List of Study Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive label</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local political leader 1</td>
<td>09 July 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local political leader 2</td>
<td>12 July 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader 1</td>
<td>27 June 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader 2</td>
<td>12 July 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader 3</td>
<td>17 July 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement consultant</td>
<td>06 July 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal official 1</td>
<td>21 June 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal official 2</td>
<td>10 July 2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>