

Public Participation in Canadian Local Government:
A Study of the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process in London, Ontario

MPA Research Report

Submitted to

The Local Government Program
Department of Political Science
The University of Western Ontario

Michael Hurley
October 2010

Abstract: Public Participation in Canadian Local Government - A Study of the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process in London, Ontario

The following is a formal research report on a cross-sectional study of the Meadowlily Secondary Plan process in the City of London, Ontario, Canada. The paper begins with a literature review that explores divergent findings on the value and efficacy of public participation in Canadian local government. The author then articulates his own hypotheses on the topic and describes the research design and measures that were used to test the hypotheses. The paper ends with an analysis of the findings from the study and a discussion of how these conclusions impact the literature and research question that inspired this report.

The author opines that public engagement is an essential feature of democratic citizenship and, by virtue of its local orientation, municipal government is especially well positioned to promote citizen participation. Denhart and Denhart's (2000) theory of NPS, and contemporary research from Williams (1996), Simard and Mercier (2001), Culver and Howe (2004), Fung (2004, 2006), and Sutcliffe (2008) support these propositions. Therefore, the author hypothesizes that: (H1) if citizens are included in local governance, can express their views and have them considered by municipal officials, and, as a result of doing so, believe they will influence the content of public policy, then they will be satisfied with the public participation process. (H2) At a very minimum, citizens will claim to have learned from participating in municipal governance.

In answering whether or not the facilitation of public participation in local government is a worthwhile objective (the investigator's research question), the paper confirms both hypotheses by demonstrating a notable relationship between respondents' perceived level of engagement in the MSP project and satisfaction with the public participation process. The analysis finds that, by merely participating, citizens learned about the processes of municipal government and acquired other types of lessons, irrespective of their level of involvement in the project and views toward government. These findings are congruent with existing literature that illustrates that purposeful citizen engagement in local government can foster favourable views among citizens toward the public participation process and can generate learning with regard to the processes and responsibilities of local government, as well as other forms of learning. Consistent with recent studies that endorse meaningful citizen engagement at the local level, and in keeping with the NPS theory of public administration, this research paper concludes that the facilitation of public participation in municipal government is indeed a worthwhile objective.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Theory / Literature Review	Page 4
Chapter 2 – Hypotheses	Page 16
Chapter 3 – Methodology of Study and Description of MSP Process	Page 18
Chapter 4 – Measurement	Page 28
Chapter 5 – Results and Analysis	Page 33
Chapter 6 – Generalizations and Implications for Theory	Page 47
Appendix A – Questionnaire (Citizens)	Page 49
Appendix B – Participation Index	Page 52
Appendix B2 – Participation Index Results	Page 53
Appendix C – Contingency Tables	Page 54
Appendix C2 – Contingency Tables (Controls)	Page 55
Appendix D – Percentaged Cross Tabulation for Perceived Level of Engagement and Satisfaction with MSP Process	Page 56
Appendix D2 – Value of Gamma (Strength of Relationship)	Page 57
Endnotes	Page 58
Bibliography	Page 62

Chapter 1 - Theory / Literature Reviewⁱ

Although public participation in the policy and decision-making processes of municipal government is both a fundamental aspect of citizenship and central to the proper functioning of a democracy, scholars are divided on the extent to which local participation is desirable and effective. Within federations such as the United States and Canada, municipal organizations are viewed as comprising the level of government that is ‘closest to the people’ⁱⁱ – the idea being that local governments are, or at least should be, more in touch with the needs of citizens than sub-national or federal authorities. However, the nature of modern urban life, a distrust of civic engagement among local politicians and administrators, public apathy toward government institutions and political processes, and the dominance of New Public Management ideology serve to discourage public participation in the municipal policy process. As a result, local officials rarely use citizens’ suggestions when making important decisions. This situation prevails despite the fact that several attempts by local governments to foster legitimate citizen involvement in municipal decision-making have yielded generally positive results.

Discussions of popular participation in government focus on the ‘triangle of relationships’ between individuals, communities, and governments in democratic societies.ⁱⁱⁱ Citizenship implies membership in a political community and carries with it certain rights and responsibilities. Many of these duties and entitlements are exercised at the municipal level, where, for instance, an individual might contact their local politician or public official to express their view on a land use proposal.^{iv} A citizen may also be a recipient of municipal services, such as welfare benefits or refuse collection. In Canada, citizens are free to organize with other community members to represent their mutual

interests.^v Consequently, citizenship includes entitlements to state services, participation in public decision-making, and the freedom to live independently. Within this context, the role of local government is to maintain a balance between the rights of individuals and a commitment to the collectivity.^{vi}

The prominence of participation in local politics as a fundamental aspect of citizenship was famously explored by Parry et al (1992) in their study of public participation in British government in the early 1990s. The authors argued that true democracy requires citizen engagement in the formulation and implementation of public policies.^{vii} Similarly, Prior and Walsh's (1993) analysis of citizenship and local government in the United Kingdom defined participation as "the (ability) of citizens to be involved in the processes of government: to express views, to have them listened to, to be informed of decisions and the reasons behind them, to criticize and complain."^{viii} More recent studies of public involvement embrace the latter definition but expand it to include the right of citizens to *shape and affect* the content of public policy.^{ix}

Municipal government is believed to be more amenable to public participation than higher levels of government because, compared to these levels, it is often physically closer and thus more accessible to the people it serves.^x Since citizens live, work, and socialize at the local level, and because municipal authorities deliver services – like education, road repairs, and social housing – that directly affect peoples' daily quality of life, local government is a logical avenue for citizen involvement.^{xi}

Yet, while administrators agree that citizens should be more involved in government decisions, and that policies cannot be effective without public input, they are skeptical of the value and efficacy of public participation.^{xii} Citizen consultation

decreases the efficiency of administrative work by creating delays and extra costs in the policy process.^{xiii} Many administrators resist sharing information with the public and use their professional expertise to justify their privileged position in decision-making processes.^{xiv} Administrators tend to perceive citizen input as uninformed and therefore unhelpful in solving the ‘wicked problems’ - complex issues that have no obvious solutions, only temporary and flawed ‘resolutions’ – that governments must address.^{xv} Furthermore, policy proposals from members of the public may conflict with a municipality’s agenda, which can compromise the mandates of elected councilors and produce confusion for administrators tasked with implementing by-laws.^{xvi}

For the most part, municipal politicians share administrators’ ambivalence toward public participation and, in particular, question the representativeness of citizen involvement. Public consultations tend to be dominated either by business elites who have a vested interest in the local economy, or by middle to upper-class property owners who organize a not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) group to oppose a development project in their neighbourhood.^{xvii} Individuals who come forward at these meetings constitute a self-selected, non-random sample and are typically wealthier, better educated, more politically engaged, and take a greater interest in current affairs than the wider population.^{xviii} As a result, elected officials are inclined to believe that input from public consultations is not representative of the community as a whole.^{xix} When attendance at public meetings is lacking, or a municipality receives a low response rate to a citizen survey, politicians may wrongly interpret the perceived lack of interest as an endorsement of the status quo.^{xx}

In conjunction with the above factors, the modern realities of urban society act as disincentives to public participation in municipal policymaking. The gigantic scale, cultural heterogeneity, ethnic diversity, and economic polarization of the globalized, twenty-first century city create a feeling of anonymity among urban dwellers.^{xxi} Due to recent social and economic trends, including the proliferation of sprawling, suburban ‘edge’ cities and the rise of post-industrial economies, people now work farther from home and the health of local economies is consistently determined by international investment decisions.^{xxii} In turn, individuals are less likely to feel attached to, or become involved in, their local community. Rather, today’s localities are increasingly comprised of different ‘communities of interest,’ centered on identities of age and ethnicity or hobbies like sports and music.^{xxiii} “As community is delinked from locality,” Lowndes (1995) writes, “its relevance as an organizing principle in urban politics decreases.”^{xxiv} Add to this the demands of everyday life, such as time constraints and family matters,^{xxv} and it is understandable why citizens - especially those who are disadvantaged by race, low income, or a lack of education^{xxvi} - rarely engage in local politics.

An argument can also be made that the prevailing culture and accompanying consultation structures in municipal government purposely restrict the capacity of individuals to influence public policy. Broadly speaking, Canadian and American municipalities have embraced the New Public Management (NPM) approach to local governance.^{xxvii} NPM emphasizes the role of citizens as rational consumers and views participation as a means of providing feedback to public officials for improving the quality and efficiency of municipal services.^{xxviii} Accordingly, consultative instruments take the form of complaint schemes or ‘customer’ surveys, which are similar to private

sector market research tools.^{xxix} The problem with such mechanisms, and NPM as a whole, is that governments are not merely service providers and citizens are not always 'clients.' Municipal organizations assist individuals who are incapable of making their own choices (children, the mentally ill), deny services in certain instances (revoking a business license), and interact with people who do not *want* to be customers (a driver receiving a speeding ticket).^{xxx} Unlike businesses, governments are expected to ascertain and represent the shared interests of the public, while applying standards of equity and fairness to policy-making and service delivery.^{xxxi} Hence, public input devices that treat citizens as consumers, and place bureaucrats in charge of responding to individual client demands,^{xxxii} are inadequate for gauging and addressing the collective needs of a community.

The intense individualism and disunity promoted by urban social, cultural, and economic forces, cynicism toward popular participation among municipal officials, and NPM ideology and practices have generated three notable trends with respect to public involvement in local government. First, citizens in the United States,^{xxxiii} Canada,^{xxxiv} and England^{xxxv} report declining levels of faith in the representative capacity of municipal institutions. In all three countries, voter turnout in local elections seldom exceeds 40 percent.^{xxxvi} Second, public consultations in North America - when they do occur - are usually designed in such a way that administrators control the ability of citizens to influence the issue at hand.^{xxxvii} Input is sought *after* politicians and bureaucrats have framed the policy, and when most decisions have already been made.^{xxxviii} Third, as a consequence of the circumstances outlined thus far, public participation frequently has little to no impact on municipal policymaking.^{xxxix} Local officials may allow citizens to

articulate their opinions in open council meetings or public consultations, but are unlikely to use this input when making decisions. For example, an analysis of public participation in the United States found that municipal government efforts to include citizens in policymaking are commonly symbolic.^{xl} A similar study of local citizen involvement in England discovered only one-third of municipal authorities believed public input had a substantial influence on final decisions.^{xli} Evidently, multiple barriers prevent purposeful citizen engagement in the local policy process.

Despite the presence of numerous barriers to public participation at the municipal level, several studies demonstrate that participation can yield notable benefits for local governments and the public. Citizen involvement in municipal policy and decision-making can foster learning with regard to the processes and responsibilities of local government, create policies that better respond to the needs of the community, and enhance the legitimacy of municipal institutions in the eyes of the public. Participation can also provide participants with new skills and engage individuals who would otherwise avoid the local policy process.

In their study of Saint John, New Brunswick's public consultation on budget issues in the fall of 2002, Culver and Howe (2004) found that participation taught residents about the workings of their local political system.^{xlii} The two authors interviewed citizens who participated in a consultation – conducted through mail-in questionnaires and an online forum - designed to obtain suggestions from the public on ways to eliminate the city's \$5 million budget deficit.^{xliii} While citizen input had virtually no impact on the final budget adopted by council, participants professed to have learned from the process and reported optimistic views with respect to future consultations.^{xliiv} A

number of people said their understanding of ‘how complicated government is’ was affected by the exercise and the overwhelming majority of respondents (94 percent) claimed they would provide their ideas again if given the opportunity.^{xlv} Residents not only gained insights into the challenges of municipal governance, but also found some value in the consultation itself.

Sutcliffe’s (2008) examination of Windsor City Council’s decisions regarding the Windsor-Detroit border crossing concludes that public participation has led to the consideration of policies that reflect the interests of and are supported by citizens. Between 2002 and 2005, council sought input from residents on the Detroit River Tunnel Partnership (DRTP), a proposal to convert the border’s rail tunnel and train tracks into an international truck route located beside a newly constructed freight passage.^{xlvi} Citizens organized the South-West Windsor Ratepayers Corporation (SWWRC) to oppose the plan, arguing that it would route truck traffic through residential neighbourhoods, create safety, noise, and pollution problems, and reduce property values. Group members attended public consultations and council meetings concerned with the proposal in order to convince councilors to reject the DRTP and consider other border plans that the Corporation preferred. In the end, council voted against the proposal^{xlvii} and drafted its own plan, the 2005 Schwartz Report, for restructuring the border crossing.^{xlviii} Council’s rejection of the DRTP cleared the way for a collection of border proposals, some of which are modeled on the Report, that are seen by councilors, experts, and citizens as technically superior to the DRTP.^{xlix} According to Sutcliffe, these plans better respond to the wishes of, and have a wider degree of acceptance from, the Windsor community.¹

An analysis of Quebec City's participatory planning process in the revitalization of the city's historic Saint Roch neighbourhood discovered that participation increased the legitimacy of urban renewal by decreasing conflict between interested parties and creating a sense of ownership among stakeholders for the initiative's outcomes.^{li} One of the program's projects included the removal of the Centre-ville Mall roof. Since the mall is located on the community's main business hub, St. Joseph Street, many citizens possessed a sentimental attachment to the structure that existed prior to renovations.^{lii} To reduce the controversy surrounding the project, Quebec City staff solicited suggestions for the redesign through a public consultation process, which resulted in a monitoring committee partnership. The committee brought together a wide range of social groups in the neighbourhood, from developers and shopkeepers to social workers and activists,^{liii} and fostered a renewed sense of community for the residents involved.^{liv}

Of particular importance were the positive perceptions of the mall renovation among citizens who were consulted on the project. Participants were interviewed shortly after the completion of the redesign and expressed high levels of satisfaction with the outcome.^{lv} In terms of approval, there was little disagreement between committee members, on the one hand, and the political and economic actors responsible for implementing the renovation, on the other.^{lvi} Simard and Mercier (2001) observed that Quebec City's inclusion of Saint Roch residents in the Centre-ville Mall planning process contributed both to community building at the neighbourhood level and public acceptance of the final decision.^{lvii}

Shortly after the election of a reform-minded council in 1995, the Township of Kenyon, Ontario enacted a *Three Year Strategic Plan* that called for "greater public

input, improved council deliberations,” and “more direct democracy.”^{lviii} In keeping with this transparent approach to policymaking, the municipality held large, well-advertised, and participative public meetings to garner ideas from citizens on road maintenance, property standards, waste management, economic development, and recreation.

Councilors led these deliberations by defining issues, articulating possible responses, and inviting experts – like waste management analysts – to inform attendees and stimulate discussion.^{lix} Residents were then asked to elect policymaking committees, comprised of individuals who expressed strong and diverse opinions in consultations, to work with council and staff. In some cases, councilors appointed committee members from a list of interested persons identified at public meetings.^{lx}

Every policy advisory committee was given a mandate for operation and assigned a liaison person from council. The groups met quarterly, or whenever necessary, and reported to council at least once a year.^{lxi} Committees were composed of five to six people who either shared an interest or possessed some expertise in a specific policy area. Blair Williams, a former Kenyon councilor, contends the advisory groups were “highly beneficial in the creation and refinement of policies” and their effectiveness afforded greater legitimacy to the actions of the municipality.^{lxii} For instance, over a period of four months, the property standards committee worked to draft a widely supported by-law that was adopted by council with only minor changes. During the process, citizens were informed of the group’s progress through the *Kenyon Community Newsletter*, which was also overseen and produced by its own committee.^{lxiii}

A similar but more extensive initiative is currently underway in Chicago, Illinois. As part of an organizational commitment to accountable, community-based policing, the

Chicago Police Department holds open ‘beat meetings’ in 280 neighbourhoods across the city.^{lxiv} The meetings enable residents to propose solutions to local crime and public safety problems. Fung (2006) claims the gatherings are a valuable policy tool because citizens “often develop different...approaches than professional police.”^{lxv} In fact, a core of active residents actually engage in the implementation of strategies by familiarizing themselves with police procedures, the courts, and city services, and monitoring ‘hot spots’ such as liquor stores and drug houses.

At beat meetings, citizens discuss plans of action, select the ones that seem most promising, and construct beat schemes that establish those ideas as official, sub-local policy.^{lxvi} Participants devote significant time and energy to the meetings because they are confident that their efforts will yield concrete public goods, like safer streets. Oftentimes, residents and officers experiment with a particular approach, observe its effects, and decide if they should maintain the existing policy or try other techniques.^{lxvii}

Studies of the beat meetings reveal that they achieve substantial levels of public participation. Between January 1995 and June 1999, more than six thousand Chicagoans attended the meetings every month, with average attendance of twenty-one citizens per meeting.^{lxviii} Residents from low-income neighbourhoods participate at rates higher than those from wealthy ones, owing to the fact that crime is a pressing matter in disadvantaged communities.^{lxix}

Contrary to the expectations of skeptics, poor areas institute slightly better problem-solving programs than neighbourhoods with median incomes. A report by the Institute for Policy Research (1999) found that three of the four programs ranked as ‘excellent’ came from low-income communities, and only one of the six failures was

located in a poor beat.^{lxx} An earlier study that used social capital - the degree to which citizens engage in networks of associations and relationships at the local level - as the control variable reached an identical conclusion. It discovered that four of the beats that rated highest in quality of policing were areas with little community capacity.^{lxxi}

Therefore, even in neighbourhoods that lack adequate social and material resources, the beat meetings foster broad participation and develop generally positive policy outcomes. Moreover, these gatherings attract individuals who would potentially refrain from attending traditional public consultations. In the words of Fung (2004), “the numerous sites of political participation offered by community policing create opportunities for the engagement of people of colour that simply did not exist before the reforms.”^{lxxii}

Lastly, to ameliorate the distributive injustices entrenched in its annual budget process, the Municipality of Porto Alegre, Brazil launched a participatory budget exercise in the early 1990s. The governing Workers’ Party shifted capital budget decisions from the exclusive purview of city council to a system of neighbourhood and citywide popular assemblies.^{lxxiii} The system, which remains in place today, empowers citizens and civic associations to determine local investment priorities at a series of public meetings held throughout the year. Expressed preferences are then aggregated into an overall budget. This procedure is intended to direct public spending toward poorer areas of the city, as residents from these neighbourhoods were discouraged from engaging in budget deliberations prior to the reform.^{lxxiv}

As a direct consequence of the participatory budget process, the percentage of neighbourhoods with running water has risen from 75 to 98 percent.^{lxxv} Sewer coverage has increased 53-fold and the number of families with access to housing assistance has

grown by 16 percent.^{lxxvi} The mechanism has accomplished its goal of redistributing municipal resources by changing the actors who authorize spending priorities. Decision-making power has transferred from the hands of financial bureaucrats and elected councilors to citizens.^{lxxvii} Since people with lower incomes are more likely to participate in the process than wealthier residents, the budget now addresses issues that are urgent for the poor, including problems with sanitation, urban infrastructure, and housing. Clearly, then, there are multiple instances where the facilitation of public participation has yielded notable benefits for municipal governments and citizens alike.

Chapter 2 - Hypotheses^{lxxviii}

The existing academic division on the value and efficacy of public participation in local government suggests that more research is needed on this topic. It is worth noting that most studies emphasizing the minimal impact of citizen input on municipal policy and decision making were published prior to 2000.^{lxxix} Much of the research supporting the positive, beneficial role of participation – for example, the cases cited above – has emerged only recently (2001 onward).^{lxxx} Hence it could be that, in practice, a consensus is coalescing around the notion that stronger citizen involvement in municipal governance is possible and effective. Such an outlook is consistent with the New Public Service (NPS) model of administration, a philosophy that calls on public officials to help citizens voice and realize their mutual interests.^{lxxxii} The NPS envisions local government as a community builder and supporter, focused on the shared desires of the public and willing to facilitate citizen action in the political system.^{lxxxii} Under this model, “politicians and public managers...respond to the requests of citizens...by saying, ‘let’s work together (on) what we’re going to do, then make it happen.’”^{lxxxiii}

As noted earlier, public engagement is an essential feature of democratic citizenship and, by virtue of its local orientation, municipal government is especially well positioned to promote citizen participation. Denhart and Denhart’s (2000) theory of NPS, and contemporary research from Williams (1996), Simard and Mercier (2001), Culver and Howe (2004), Fung (2004, 2006), and Sutcliffe (2008) support these propositions. Hence, the author hypothesizes the following: (H1) if citizens are included in local governance, can express their views and have them considered by municipal officials, and, as a result of doing so, believe they will influence the content of public policy, then

they will be satisfied with the public participation process. (H2) At a very minimum, citizens will claim to have learned from participating in municipal governance.

Chapter 3 - Methodology of Study and Description of Meadowlily Secondary

Process^{lxxxiv}

To test the above hypotheses, and to augment the current literature on the benefits, drawbacks, and impact of public participation in local government, the author conducted a cross-sectional study of citizens who participated in a municipal effort to proactively involve the public in a land use planning process. By assessing respondents' views toward their level of engagement and whether or not they will actually shape the policy outcome, the degree to which they are satisfied with the process, and whether or not they learned from it, an attempt is made to answer the research question, 'is the facilitation of public participation in local government a worthwhile objective?'

Survey research was elicited through an online questionnaire. Notice of the survey was distributed by mail to all citizens who received notifications from the City of London, Ontario regarding the Meadowlily Secondary Plan (MSP) Process. The MSP project was selected for study because it constitutes an explicit attempt by a municipality to involve the public in constructing a policy that will determine the long-term function and land use of an undeveloped area.^{lxxxv} Participants were asked by the city to "shape the future of Meadowlily" before staff and council render decisions pertaining to the area's land use.^{lxxxvi} The MSP Process' *Notice of Project Commencement* stated that:

Community stakeholders will be given multiple opportunities to...attend interactive workshops and presentations; review draft reports...(and) discuss ideas and concerns directly with the city staff and consultant team coordinating (the) process. This...will lead to the creation of a City Council-adopted Secondary Plan - a policy document that will form part of our City's Official Plan, and provide detailed direction on sustainable development, community design, protection of the area's important natural resources...(and) community service and public infrastructure improvements.^{lxxxvii}

The Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process was launched by the City of London's Planning Department shortly after Commercial Centres Limited – widely known to the Ontario public as Smart Centres – submitted a land use application to the municipality in

September 2007 requesting permission to develop 25,500 square metres of retail commercial space on a property located at 168 Meadowlily Road South in the southeast end of the city.^{lxxxviii} The application sought to change the property's land use designation under London's Official Plan from a Holding Urban Reserve to an Associated (Commercial) Shopping Area and asked for zoning amendments that would allow for a range of retail, commercial, and service uses on the subject site. Specifically, the proposed development was to consist of an anchor retail store of approximately 20,000 square metres and five smaller, stand-alone buildings totaling 5,500 square metres in commercial retail and service space.^{lxxxix} The site is situated on the northeast corner of Meadowlily Road South and Commissioners Road East directly abutting the Meadowlily Woods Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) to the north and the City Wide Sports Park to the east. Single detached homes can be found west of the property on Meadowlily Road while a retail centre of roughly 33,000 square metres is located south of the site on Commissioners Road.^{xc}

In November 2007, a public notice of the application was sent to 72 landowners who live within 120 metres of the property and was also published in the municipality's local newspaper, *The London Free Press*. The City received 72 responses to the notice, most of which opposed the application due to concerns surrounding the natural and built heritage of the site, the availability of vacant commercial space across the street, potentially better uses for the property, the negative traffic impacts that a retail development would inflict upon the community, and claims that Wal-Mart (the retailer that would occupy the anchor store) is a bad corporate citizen because it has an adverse effect on the environment and the communities in which it operates.^{xc1}

Similar concerns were echoed at a public consultation meeting in September 2008, where City Council and staff solicited further citizen input on the application. Nearly two hundred Londoners attended the meeting^{xcii} and, with the exception of the agent representing the developer, all of the thirty-five people who made oral submissions either expressed their opposition to the Smart Centres application or requested that the municipality reject it outright.^{xciii}

Several citizens and representatives of community groups argued that the proposed development would have a devastating impact on Meadowlily Woods, which is recognized by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, and the City of London as an Environmentally Significant Area. The ESA is one of the largest remaining natural areas in the municipality and is home to over 150 species of birds, some of which are protected by the provincial *Endangered Species Act* (2007).^{xciv} Local residents frequently use its trail paths for hiking and bicycling and elementary schools visit the ESA to conduct outdoor education.^{xcv} Many citizens noted that a large-scale commercial retail development is inappropriate for the area since its lights, paved parking lot, rainwater run-off, traffic, and resultant air pollution would adversely affect the ‘ecological treasure’ and rare wildlife beside it.^{xcvi} Some of these residents asked City Council and staff to not only reject the Smart Centres application but also designate the subject site as open space parkland and expand the existing ESA.^{xcvii}

Other attendees at the meeting observed that the area surrounding the subject site – including the Meadowlily Nature Preserve that is located northwest of the property and across the street on Meadowlily Road – is rich in history, culture, and archaeological

features that have not been fully studied.^{xcviii} For instance, the ESA includes the one-and-a-half centuries-old, heritage-designated homestead of Park Farm (1849), the 1910 Meadowlily Bridge, and the ruins of a mill that was built in 1840.^{xcix} A representative of the neighbourhood group the Friends of Meadowlily Woods, which mobilized to oppose the Smart Centres application and protect the ESA, recommended that the property and natural areas adjacent to it be recognized as a heritage district within the city.^c

Numerous citizens opined that, in light of its natural features and surroundings, the subject site would be better utilized as parkland or as the location of an environmental ‘interpretive’ or community centre.^{ci} Attendees insisted this was a reasonable suggestion particularly because vacant commercial lands situated across the street from the property could easily accommodate the proposed development.^{cii} A minority of residents opposed the application on the grounds that a retail commercial centre would decrease property values by bringing additional noise, litter, and vehicular traffic to the area, the latter of which – it was claimed - would potentially endanger pedestrians and cyclists on Meadowlily Road.^{ciii} A few citizens cited Wal-Mart’s tendency to offer low-paying jobs, and the existing availability of a Wal-Mart on nearby Clarke Road, as reasons why the City should reject a Smart Centres development in the Meadowlily area.^{civ} As this paper will later discuss, virtually all of the concerns that were raised at the September 2008 public consultation meeting, and outlined above, were reiterated during the MSP Process.

In response to the overwhelming public opposition to the Smart Centres application and city staff’s dissatisfaction with various technical aspects of the proposed development,^{cv} London City Council decided in October 2008 to defer the application and directed staff to initiate a City-led Area Plan for the lands designated Urban Reserve

east of Highbury Avenue and surrounding Meadowlily Road South.^{cvi} Staff were also asked to report back to Council with the Terms of Reference for the Area Plan study by January 2009 and to conduct an environmental impact analysis of the sports fields adjacent to the subject site as part of the study.^{cvi} It was later determined by staff and Council that the Meadowlily Area Planning Study would involve a series of technical studies (natural heritage, cultural, land use allocation) conducted by staff and multiple interactive and deliberative public consultations that would inform the creation of the Meadowlily Secondary Plan (MSP) to be voted on by Council.^{cvi} Consequently, when this author mentions the Area Planning Study he is referring to both the staff studies and consultations meetings that were and will be carried out as part of the overall Study, whereas ‘the MSP Process’ solely refers to the two public consultation meetings that comprise the focus of the survey and this paper. It should also be noted that the Study and Process are slated for completion in June 2011,^{cix} so survey respondents simply reflected on their experience with the project thus far.

Throughout the project, citizens had access to relevant information on the Meadowlily area via the City of London website, and were asked to provide their input at two community meetings – a Public Visioning Session in February 2010 and a Community Design Workshop in April 2010. Notice of the meetings was mailed to citizens who submitted an opinion to the City of London’s Planning Department regarding the Smart Centres application, expressed their thoughts to the municipality on the Meadowlily Area Planning Study, or requested to be kept informed on the application or Study. The notices were also posted on the City website and published in the municipality’s local newspaper, *The London Free Press*.^{cx}

The study area of Meadowlily, for the purpose of the planning process is approximately 95 hectares of land.^{cxv} Currently 65 hectares is publicly owned by the City of London or the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, and is designated as "Open Space".^{cxii} Additionally, there is approximately 30 hectares of land within the "Urban Reserve, Community Growth" (URCG) designation.^{cxiii} The "Urban Reserve" designation signifies the intent of city council to support urban development at some point in this area. This intent is dependent upon the completion of component studies to identify the important natural heritage of Meadowlily.^{cxiv} It is within the URCG designation that the Smart Centres are seeking development.

At the Community Visioning Session, the city staff and consultants presented an overview and objectives of the study process and engaged approximately 40 community stakeholders in discussion about potential development in the study area of Meadowlily.^{cxv} The consultants and city staff conducted the session by employing a "community visioning exercise,"^{cxvi} whereby attendees of the session discussed their ideas for Meadowlily and were provided with workbooks to record their individual thoughts and ideas about the process and their vision for Meadowlily. Participants were divided into six groups where they discussed their vision of Meadowlily. Discussions were structured around four core land use planning themes - liveable, attractive, sustainable, and unique - related to community building and creating a sense of place in the Meadowlily area.^{cxvii} The stakeholders then summarized the points made in group discussions and presented them to the larger group as a whole. Additionally, participants were encouraged to submit the 'open comment' feedback pages to the project team and

were invited to participate in a self-guided visual preference survey in which they commented on pictures of various development scenarios.

The second public consultation event, Community Design Workshop, was held on April 27, 2010.^{cxviii} The aim of the workshop was to afford stakeholders an opportunity to develop a variety of options for conservation efforts and land use development in the study area and examine the strengths and weaknesses of the various concepts.

Participants were divided into six groups, provided with a base plan of the study area, and a variety of foam models of building typologies including: park spaces, community centres, retail centres and residential dwellings.^{cxix} Groups worked collaboratively to design three alternative land use, conservation and development scenarios each with a different focus- a passive, open space option, a "middle ground" option, and a built-up option with a focus on creating residential and retail developments.^{cxx} With each design, groups considered the strengths and weaknesses of the land use and its impact on the community. The goal of this design exercise was to promote discourse of the various options of land use among parties with differing interests and visions for Meadowlily.

The Planning Department provided the author with an address list of every citizen and community group that was notified by the City of the Meadowlily Area Planning Study, Visioning Session, and Community Design Workshop, as well as all households located within the immediate vicinity of 168 Meadowlily Road South. These people were contacted by mail and asked to complete an online survey, based on the assumption that those who expressed interest in the Smart Centres application or Area Planning Study, and residents who live near the contested property site, may have participated in the Public Visioning Session or Community Design Workshop. They comprise the sampling

frame of this study. The investigator utilized this form of purposive sampling because – for privacy reasons – the City could not disclose the precise identities of citizens who participated in the Process. Therefore, the survey results exclude the opinions of Londoners who attended the Visioning Session, Workshop, or both, but did not previously submit an opinion to the City on the Smart Centres application or Area Planning Study, or request to receive updates on these items. It is difficult to estimate how many participants belong to this particular group of non-respondents.

The researcher also chose not to contact individuals and groups identified by the municipality as ‘stakeholders’ for two reasons. First, most of the people listed on the stakeholders contact sheet appear to be legal, planning, and real estate representatives involved with preparing, securing approval for, and advancing the Smart Centres application. For example, the list includes the developer and their planning consultants (Zelinka Priamo Ltd). Since these stakeholders have a private economic interest in ensuring that development moves forward at the subject property site, and therefore likely oppose any delays to the development process, it is entirely possible that they object to the City’s decision to solicit further public input through the MSP Process. Hence, stakeholder responses could have biased the survey results toward respondents who claim to be dissatisfied with the project, irrespective of the facilitators’ performance in conducting the Process. Second, the author is primarily interested in the opinions of citizens and organizations in London’s civil society – that is, community groups and centres, neighbourhood associations, faith-based organizations, and charities^{cxxi} - who participated in the exercise. Presumably, these members of the public would be more inclined to give an honest assessment of their experience with the project than those who

have a private interest or financial stake in the Smart Centres application, and who possibly resent the Process being held in the first place.

The questionnaire gathered nominal and ordinal data from individual subjects in order to confirm or refute the author's hypotheses. An online survey was chosen because it was inexpensive for the investigator, convenient and easy to read for respondents, and useful for producing rich data based on clearly written questions. Due to time and monetary constraints, the author did not mail follow-up reminders to potential respondents.

Of the 132 individuals and community groups that were contacted by the researcher, 22 responded to the online survey. This equates to a response rate of 16 percent. Six respondents did not participate in the MSP Process, so only 16 responses were analyzed. However, the city staff reports on the Visioning Session and Workshop note that forty "project stakeholders" attended each meeting,^{cxxii} and 56 percent of survey respondents participated in both exercises. Assuming this percentage of overlap among participants is reflective of the entire target population of the study, the author estimates that the questionnaire captured complete responses from 36 percent of all citizens who participated in the MSP Process. This calculation is based on the assumption that 56 percent of 80 possible participants attended both meetings - which amounts to 45 unique participants - and 16 responses divided by 45 equals 36 percent. Since over one-third of project participants responded to the survey (based on the author's own estimate), the results convey a reasonably accurate portrait of the MSP Process. Nevertheless, given the small size of the study sample, the findings of this paper must be interpreted as

exploratory research that can be used to generate hypotheses to be more fully tested by additional research.

In terms of design, the questionnaire was short with logically arranged items, an attractive layout, numbered questions, and sufficient space between items. The online survey included a cover letter indicating the importance of the study and the value of the respondent's participation. Subject anonymity was guaranteed. As well, the cover letter and survey questions were approved by the Department of Political Science Research Ethics Committee at the University of Western Ontario. All of these procedures are consistent with the methodology employed by Culver and Howe (2004),^{cxiii} as well as the strategies discussed by O'Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner (2008) in *Research Methods for Public Administrators*.

Chapter 4 - Measurement^{cxxiv}

The author's hypotheses were tested with a series of closed-ended, open-ended, and filter questions designed to elicit information on facts, behaviours, opinions, and attitudes. The survey and questionnaire items are enclosed in Appendix A of this paper. All of the concepts expressed in the two hypotheses were operationalized with measurable independent and dependent variables. Respondents who did not belong to the survey's target population – that is, citizens who participated in the MSP Process – were identified by answering 'I did not participate in the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process' in the first question (see Appendix A). Their responses have been excluded from this analysis.

Questionnaire Items 2 and 3 are meant to gauge whether or not the MSP project allowed for meaningful public participation. Question 2 measures the independent variable in Hypothesis 1 – “if citizens...can express their views” – by asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “I received adequate opportunities to express my views.” Question 3 measures the same concept as Question 2, but is intended to assess the level of ‘openness’ in the MSP project. Even if citizens received plenty of opportunities to state their ideas, they may have felt intimidated when speaking or they might have found that time constraints or rules of engagement prevented them from expressing their honest opinion. Conversely, general agreement with Questions 2 and 3 would suggest the Process was transparent and inclusive in the eyes of participants.

Item 4 measures the second independent variable in Hypothesis 1, which is whether or not municipal officials – and the consultants who conducted the project – seriously considered participants' viewpoints. City staff members and consultants may

have properly recorded peoples' suggestions during the Process, but citizens might believe that the facilitators did not genuinely contemplate this input. Broad agreement with Questions 4 and 5 would show that citizens think municipal officials legitimately considered their views, whereas general disagreement would demonstrate the reverse scenario. See Appendix A.

Questionnaire Item 5 assesses respondents' perceptions of their potential impact on the substantive content of the Meadowlily Secondary Plan (the third independent variable). Therefore, the item gauges the predicted political efficacy of citizens in the MSP process. If most participants 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' that their "written input and/or verbal comments will likely influence the content of the Plan," then it is fair to reason that citizens believe they will affect the project's policy outcome. Presumably, respondents who agree with Question 6 would also concur with the statements in previous items. Certain participants might not believe that they will personally shape the MSP, but may nevertheless feel that their interests will be reflected in the Plan (Question 6). In any case, substantial agreement with Items 5 and 6 would suggest that participants think their input will influence the MSP, while a majority of 'Strongly Disagree' and 'Disagree' responses would denote the opposite.

Questions 7 through 9 are designed to measure the control variables of gender, age, and ethnicity. The author did not expect that these factors would significantly impact participants' satisfaction with the way the MSP process was conducted, or whether citizens learned from participating in the project (the two dependent variables), but the responses were still analyzed to see if they varied substantially according to the controls. For example, the survey could have found that Caucasian males between the ages of 36

and 75 were more likely to express their views during the project and claim satisfaction with the Process than South Asian females. At the advice of O'Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner (2008), the investigator purposely avoided placing demographic questions at the beginning or end of the questionnaire so that respondents did not question the study's purpose or become worried about their anonymity (see Appendix A).

Item 10 is intended to gauge the questionnaire's definitive control variable: whether citizens hold positive, negative, or neutral views toward government. The author assumed that most participants would have positive or neutral outlooks since they probably would not have participated in the MSP process if they were convinced that government is useless, negative, or does not listen to the demands of the public. Conversely, respondents who think that government "has a detrimental impact on society" may have expressed dissatisfaction with the MSP and the way the project was carried out *even if* most citizens felt they were given adequate opportunities to express their opinions and were convinced that they will influence the policy outcome. The problem with this measure is that responses may be coloured, completely or in part, by an individual's experience in the Process. If municipal officials are dismissive of participants' suggestions, and if citizens believe that their input will have little effect on the MSP, then some respondents may base their overall perception of government on their disappointment with the project. The author tried to account for this bias by including the statement, "Putting aside your experience in the Meadowlily Secondary Plan process," in the questionnaire item.

Question 11 assesses the dependent variable in Hypotheses 1. The researcher predicted that participants who believe they were able to articulate their views (IVs 2 and

3), have their ideas considered by municipal officials (IVs 4 and 5), and possibly shape the MSP (IV 6) would be 'Very Satisfied' or 'Satisfied' with the project's coordination (DP 1). By contrast, respondents who felt they were excluded from the process, ignored by municipal officials, and unable to affect the MSP would be 'Dissatisfied' or 'Very Dissatisfied' with the way the project was executed. A third possibility was that the null hypothesis for H1 would be confirmed, and the hypothesis would be rejected. Under this scenario, citizens would claim dissatisfaction with the process methodology even if they agreed with all of the measures of the independent variables (Questionnaire Items 2 through 6). Similarly, participants may have been satisfied with the way the MSP Process was conducted but disagreed with Items 2 to 7. Confirmation of the null hypotheses for H1 would suggest there is a weak relationship, or no correlation at all, between the degree of public engagement – ranging from symbolic to meaningful – and citizen satisfaction (Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied) with the Process.

Item 12 is an open-ended question that measures the dependent variable – learning from participation - in Hypothesis 2. To reiterate, the investigator thought that, through participation, respondents would have learned from their experience in the Process, regardless of whether they were satisfied (or not) with the project and its result. The question asks, "What, if anything, did you learn from participating in the process?" Answers were categorized into responses that claimed 'no learning' and those that fell under 'workings of local government.' Responses that fit this latter classification included: a newfound respect for the complexity or challenges of municipal government, an appreciation for the work of local administrators and politicians, an awareness of the difficulty in balancing divergent interests, a realization of the importance of citizen

engagement in municipal governance, or an understanding of the land use planning process. Responses that identified different types of learning, such as skills acquisition or exposure to new or alternative viewpoints, were classified as ‘other.’

Chapter 5 - Results and Analysis^{xxxv}

As mentioned earlier, roughly 56 percent of respondents attended both the Public Visioning Session and Community Design Workshop in February and April 2010, respectively, which means a majority of respondents were able to comment on their experience with the entire MSP Process thus far. One-quarter of respondents only participated in the Workshop while 19 percent exclusively attended the Visioning Session.

With respect to Questionnaire Item 2, a significant majority (69%) of respondents either agreed (50%) or strongly agreed (19%) that they received adequate opportunities to express their views. Similarly, responses to Question 3 reveal that most participants (81%) agreed they could openly state their honest opinion when they were called upon to speak. Therefore, a majority of respondents did not believe that the Process's rules of engagement were intimidating, confusing, or prevented them from expressing their views. It is fair to reason, then, that the thematic small group discussions, feedback pages, and visual preference surveys from the Visioning Session and the collaborative assessments of different land use models in the Design Workshop were largely effective in allowing and encouraging citizens to articulate their opinions. In this sense, the Process was transparent and inclusive in the eyes of most participants.

However, in Questionnaire Item 2, a minority of respondents (25%) did not feel that they were given sufficient opportunities to relay their thoughts to city staff and consultants. One respondent offered a possible explanation for some of these answers by describing what they learned from the project in Question 12: "when governments... want to get answers with specific outcomes preset at the outset, it kills a certain kind of

openness and creativity.” Thus, it could be that some participants felt the structured and themed discussions and facilitator-designed land use models framed the discussion in a restrictive or negative way, or discouraged certain types of views from being shared.

Answers to Item 4 suggest that a substantial plurality of respondents were skeptical of or reserving judgment as to whether their ideas were legitimately contemplated by city staff and consultants. Approximately 44 percent of participants neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement that their ‘viewpoints were seriously considered by the Process facilitators.’ Here again, responses to Question 12 provided some insight as to why a large number of respondents felt this way. One participant observed that “the city is trying but it is unclear how and if the input will be used,” while another stated “I will await the results (of the Process) to decide how I feel about the ways in which citizen input was respected...or not.” These sentiments were echoed by a respondent who noted that “City Planning Staff and consultants appeared to listen to suggestions, but the results of public input won’t be known until the Area Plan is presented.”

Unsurprisingly, responses to Question 5 closely mimicked the answers to Item 4. Nearly 44 percent of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that their ‘written input and/or verbal comments will likely influence the content of the (Meadowlily) Secondary Plan.’ Comments from Question 12 elaborated on this result and demonstrated that citizens lacked confidence in their ability to potentially shape the MSP. For example, one respondent admitted “I don’t know if what I said will be taken under consideration” and another participant who claimed to be interested in preserving the ESA said, “sadly, the decision to pave...over (the subject site) sounds like it is already made.” The results of

Questionnaire Items 4 and 5 are consistent with the findings from the literature review that criticize the value and efficacy of municipal public participation efforts because local officials often allow citizens to articulate their opinions in open council meetings or public consultations but do not use this input when making decisions. On the one hand the inclination of respondents to be skeptical of or reserve judgment as to whether their input was considered by the facilitators and will probably influence the MSP is understandable since both the Process and Meadowlily Area Planning Study are still incomplete. But it is clear from the questionnaire responses that the city staff members and consultants who conducted the project did not manage to convince most of the survey participants that their opinions were seriously contemplated and will impact the substantive content of the MSP.

An additional plausible explanation for the skepticism among respondents is the fact that the visual images and models of possible land use scenarios for the Meadowlily Study Area – which were designed by the Process facilitators and presented to participants at the Visioning Session and Workshop – did not seem to reflect the input that city staff received from citizens at the September 2008 public consultation meeting and during the project itself. For instance, the vast majority of residents at the first public meeting opposed development on the subject site, but at the Visioning Session only eight of the forty-eight pictures in the visual preference survey conveyed a ‘no development’ or ‘low-impact’ land use scenario.^{cxxvi} The other forty pictures depicted some form of residential, mixed use, recreational, or commercial retail development for the area.^{cxxvii} Likewise, the City’s “What we heard” summary of comments received at the Visioning Session noted that most participants either opposed development of any kind, sought to

preserve the natural character of the ESA and subject site, or proposed a ‘low-impact’ land use for the property.^{cxxviii} Yet only one of the three land use concept models presented at the Community Design Workshop portrayed a ‘passive,’ open space option, whereas the other two models envisioned moderate, ‘middle ground’ development or intensive, ‘built-up’ urban land uses on the subject site and in the Study Area.^{cxxix}

Despite the general skepticism, caution, and doubt that respondents expressed in relation to their predicted impact on the MSP and whether their input was duly noted by the Process facilitators, approximately 37 percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that their viewpoints were seriously considered by staff and consultants *and* that their ‘written input and/or verbal comments will likely influence the content of the Secondary Plan.’ However, only one of the responses to Questionnaire Item 12 put forward a possible explanation for this result, as one participant claimed to be impressed with “the care (that) the city was prepared to take in consulting citizens regarding their views.” Nevertheless, the reservations and lack of confidence expressed by most respondents with respect to their influence and political efficacy in the Process can probably explain why a majority (56%) of participants neither agreed or disagreed that their “interests will likely be reflected in the Secondary Plan” (Question 6). By contrast, a mere 25 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

For Questionnaire Items 2 to 6, the researcher assigned values to responses and totaled the numbers to determine each respondent’s perceived level of engagement in the MSP process. Values could have ranged from 5 to 25 and these scores were categorized as ‘Unengaged’ (5-11), ‘Engaged’ (12-18), and ‘Very Engaged’ (19-25). Grouping the independent variables into a Participation Index allowed for direct comparison with the

dependent variables – to see whether a relationship exists - and avoided cluttering the contingency tables (See Appendices B, B2, and C). Although a large number of respondents were unsure or suspicious of their predicted political impact in the project, the overwhelming majority (88% rounded up) of participants registered as engaged (44%) or very engaged (44%) on the Participation Index. Only two respondents (12% rounded down) were unengaged while participating in the Process. Thus, even though city staff and consultants failed to assure most participants that their input was valued and will influence the content of the MSP, they successfully engaged the majority of respondents in a procedural sense. See Table 1, Appendix C.

With regard to Question 7, just under two-thirds (62.5%) of participants who responded to the survey were males and slightly more than one-third of respondents (37.5%) were females. The researcher did not expect that responses to Questionnaire Items 2 through 6 and satisfaction with the Process would vary considerably by gender, but more males (50%) were satisfied with the project than females (33%) by a difference of 17 percentage points. This can perhaps be explained by the fact that more males (40%) believed their viewpoints were seriously considered by the Process facilitators than females (33%). But many more females (50%) felt their input will possibly impact the substance of the MSP than males (30%), and more females (33%) thought their interests will likely be reflected in the Plan than males (10%), so the aforementioned responses to Question 4 do not provide a definitive explanation of why, as a percentage, more males were satisfied with the project than females. Furthermore, roughly the same percentages of males (70%) and females (67%) agreed that they received adequate opportunities to express their views, and 80 percent of males and 83 percent of females agreed that, when

called upon to speak, they could openly state their honest opinion. Hence, the author suspects but cannot confirm that the difference in satisfaction with the MSP project among males and females was simply a coincidence and not necessarily related to gender or how males and females were treated by the Process facilitators. This conclusion is supported by the fact that gender bias was not mentioned by respondents as an important factor or observation in the open-ended answers to Question 12.

The researcher did not examine whether satisfaction with the MSP project (H1) or citizen learning (H2) varied according to age (Question 8) and ethnicity (Question 9) because 94 percent of respondents were either middle-aged adults between the ages of 36 and 55 years old (50%) or senior adults between the ages of 56 and 75 years old (44%). Only one respondent (6%) was an elderly person between the ages of 76 and 95 years old. In terms of the ethnicity of participants who responded to the survey, 94 percent were White (Caucasian) and one respondent (6%) chose not to identify their ethnicity by answering 'Other' to Question 9.

As expected for Questionnaire Item 10, the majority of respondents held positive or neutral views toward government. When asked which statement best reflects their overall opinion of government, 63 percent of participants said 'government plays a positive role in the lives of citizens' while 31 percent claimed to have a 'neutral' view on the matter or no opinion at all. To reiterate, the author assumed that most participants would have positive or neutral outlooks since they presumably would not have participated in the Process if they were convinced that government is useless, negative, or does not listen to the demands of the public. A single respondent (6%) professed a negative view toward government by selecting the statement, 'government has a

detrimental impact on society.’ The investigator will discuss the significance of these results when analyzing the affect of the ‘views toward government’ control variable on Hypotheses 1 and 2 below.

In response to Questionnaire Item 11, participants were divided in their satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the MSP Process. Approximately 44 percent of respondents were satisfied (38%) or very satisfied (6%) with the way the project was conducted, versus 44 percent who were dissatisfied (38%) or very dissatisfied (6%). Roughly 13 percent of participants who responded to the survey were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the Process methodology.

Based on the answers to Question 12, respondents who were satisfied or very satisfied claimed that they learned about other people’s views, acquired new skills from participating, were impressed with the way in which the project facilitators conducted the Process, noted that city staff and consultants listened to suggestions, and said their participation made them more aware of the importance of citizen involvement in local governance and the difference that engaged residents can make “in the way the Forest City (London) grows.” These responses are congruent with the case studies in the literature review that emphasize the positive and beneficial impacts of public participation in municipal government.

Conversely, responses to Questionnaire Item 12 from participants who were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied reveal that these participants felt the Process needlessly focused on “the form (and) function of urban development proposals” instead of protecting the ESA, believed that the project was corrupted by the involvement of representatives from Smart Centres, and claimed that they learned “a very small but well

organized protest group can intimidate local government to the point where (it is) afraid to make an informed decision.” Others complained that the Process was ostensibly rhetorical and that decisions regarding the development of the subject site had already been made prior to the Visioning Session and Workshop. As an example, one respondent said, “city staff seem to have decided in advance that the (Smart Centres) development should proceed. Public input was that it should be stopped, and feedback to that effect seemed to be ignored (or) downplayed.” Another participant asserted that “most decisions are made...in-house between the developer and Planning Department...before the public are notified,” a comment that is consistent with some of the findings from the literature review that question the value and efficacy of public participation at the local level.

While the direct relationship between these claims and respondents’ satisfaction with the MSP Process was not tested by this author and does not form the focus of this study, the remarks can perhaps partly explain why 71 percent of respondents who registered as ‘Engaged’ on the Participation Index were nonetheless dissatisfied with the way the project was carried out (see Appendix D).

One of the two participants who was neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the MSP Process mentioned both positive and negative aspects of their experience when describing what they learned from the project in Question 12. They said they learned “that most people care about preserving the significant area” but noted that “the decision to pave...over (the subject property) sounds like it is already made.” The other participant who expressed this level of satisfaction thought the process used in the Community Design Workshop “was creative and interesting,” but stated they will wait until the MSP is finished to decide whether “citizen input was respected...or not.” Here as well, though,

the researcher did not test the existence, significance, or strength of the relationship between these comments and respondents' satisfaction with the MSP project. But the remarks may help explain why one respondents who registered as 'Engaged' on the Participation Index was neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the Process methodology.

Table 1 (Appendix C) examines whether a statistical relationship exists between respondents' perceived level of engagement in the MSP process (the independent variable) and satisfaction with the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process (the dependent variable), as predicted in Hypothesis 1 (H1). It was assumed that changes in the independent variable (IV) would correlate with changes in the dependent variable (DV), thereby illustrating a relationship of co-variation. Specifically, the investigator believed that high levels of engagement (Very Engaged) would correlate with high levels of satisfaction with the MSP project (Satisfied), and vice versa. The categories of variables were arranged so that a perfect positive relationship would form a diagonal slope downward from the top-left cell to the bottom-right one. Responses to Questionnaire Items 12 and 13 were collapsed from five to three categories to simplify percentage calculations.

Table 1 (Appendix C) demonstrates that, consistent with Hypothesis 1, 38 percent of all respondents were 'very engaged' and 'satisfied' with the MSP Process, compared to 6 percent of participants who were 'unengaged' and 'dissatisfied.' None of the respondents who registered as unengaged on the Participation Index were satisfied with the way the project was facilitated and one participant who was 'engaged' (6%) claimed to be satisfied. Contrary to the predicted relationship in H1, 31 percent of engaged

respondents and one of the very engaged participants (6%) were dissatisfied with the Process.

Table 5 (Appendix D) shows the percentaged cross tabulation for ‘perceived level of engagement’ (IV) and ‘satisfaction with the MSP Process’ (DV). As the author hypothesized, high levels of engagement are related positively to satisfaction with the public participation process. Whereas 86 percent of ‘very engaged’ respondents were satisfied with the MSP project, only 14 percent of ‘engaged’ participants reported satisfaction. Thus, high levels of engagement were associated with an 72 percent increase in satisfaction with the Process.

For Hypothesis 1, the author used the Gamma measure of association to assess the strength and direction of the relationship between variables. Gamma was derived by calculating the number of concordant and discordant pairs of cases in the cross-tabulation (Table 5, Appendix D), finding the difference between the pairs, and dividing this difference by the sums of the pairs. The calculation was based on the following formula:

$$\text{Gamma} = \frac{\text{Number of Concordant Pairs} - \text{Number of Discordant Pairs}}{\text{Number of Concordant Pairs} + \text{Number of Discordant Pairs}}$$

Since measures of association are calculated from raw frequencies, and not percentaged data, the author converted the percentages in Table 1 to frequencies.

Table 6 (Appendix D2) displays the result of the Gamma calculation. The value of Gamma is 0.73, which indicates a relatively strong positive relationship between perceived level of engagement in the MSP Process and satisfaction with the project. This conclusion is supported by the percentaged cross tabulation of the independent and dependent variables in H1 (Table 5, Appendix D), which shows that as ‘level of engagement’ increased, respondents were more likely to be satisfied with the Process

methodology by a difference of 72 percent. Hypothesis 1 is therefore confirmed: a statistical relationship exists between respondents' perceived level of engagement in the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process and their satisfaction with the project. Changes in the independent variable correlate with changes in the dependent variable and thereby illustrate a relationship of co-variation. Specifically, high levels of engagement (Very Engaged) correlate with satisfaction with the MSP Process (Satisfied).

With respect to the affect of the 'views toward government' control variable on the relationship in H1, five of the ten respondents (50%) with a positive outlook toward government were satisfied with the project, whereas the single participant (100%) who reported a negative view toward government was dissatisfied with the Process. Hence it is possible that certain respondents who expressed satisfaction were biased or forgiving in their assessment of the project because of their favourable outlook toward government, while the person who thought that 'government has a detrimental impact on society' might have expressed dissatisfaction with the Process irrespective of how well or poorly it was facilitated by the city staff members and consultants. Participants who claimed to have a neutral view or no opinion of government were almost evenly divided in their levels of satisfaction with the way the project was conducted, with 40 percent satisfied, 20 percent neutral, and 40 percent dissatisfied. Thus, it is unclear how and whether their views toward government influenced their satisfaction with the Process. See Table 3, Appendix C2.

Table 2 (Appendix C) analyzes the variables in Hypothesis 2 (H2) and is identical to Table 1 except that the DV is 'Citizen Learning from Participation in MSP Process.' Here, the author anticipated that most responses would cluster in the 'Processes of Local

Government' and 'Other' rows, but these cases would not necessarily correlate with perceived levels of engagement (the IV). In other words, learning was expected to occur regardless of a participant's degree of involvement in the MSP project. For H3 to be accepted, one-third or more of all responses needed to group in the 'Processes' and 'Other' rows in any of the IV columns.

As Table 2 (Appendix C) demonstrates, 50 percent of all respondents claimed to have learned about 'processes of local government' by participating in the project. Most of the responses that fell under this category were quoted in detail in the previous analysis of Question 11 and will not be reiterated here. Recall that answers to Question 12 that identified a newfound respect for the complexity or challenges of municipal government, an appreciation for the work of local administrators, an awareness of the difficulty in balancing divergent interests, a realization of the importance of citizen engagement in municipal governance, or an understanding of the land use planning process were classified as citizen learning regarding the processes of municipal government.

In contrast to the findings of Culver and Howe (2004), none of the responses to this author's survey proclaimed a newfound respect for the complexity or challenges of municipal government. Two responses identified learning about the importance of citizen engagement in municipal governance and were positive in tone, and two other answers mentioned an appreciation for the work of the local administrators who facilitated the Process. Three respondents gained an understanding of the land use planning process but none of these participants were satisfied with the manner in which the MSP project was carried out. These respondents complained that staff appeared to have already made

important decisions pertaining to the development and that the rules to notify residents of the development proposal were inadequate. The latter participant suggested “the range (of notification) needs to be increased to a required number of households” that might be affected by the application, as opposed to only those properties that are located within the immediate vicinity of the subject site. The third respondent who gained an understanding of the land use planning process opined that the way in which the Public Visioning Session was structured made it appear as though the facilitators wanted “answers with specific outcomes preset at the outset.” Lastly, one respondent seemed to have acquired an awareness of the difficulty in balancing divergent interests in governance, although the participant criticized London City Council and staff for not doing enough on this front. They seemed frustrated that “a very small but well organized group can intimidate local government to the point where (it is) afraid to make an informed decision.” Evidently, even though citizen learning is identified by this study as a beneficial outcome of the public participation process, not all learning in the MSP project was positive in nature.

In addition to the eight respondents (50%) who identified learning about the processes of local government, four participants (25%) mentioned ‘Other’ types of learning from participation. Three of these respondents claimed to have learned about the views of others, with one participant noting that “many citizens of London would like to see an Environmental Centre within (an expanded) ESA.” This respondent said they also learned that “average citizens are more concerned about the impacts of not ‘doing the right thing’...and want more natural areas.” Similarly, another participant learned that “most people care about preserving (the) significant area.” Consistent with the findings of Fung (2004, 2006), one respondent professed to have acquired new skills from

participating in the MSP Process. They learned “how charettes were conducted...how to better visualize plans through 3D modeling and saw the benefits of working as a team.”

In total, eight of the twelve participants who reported learning of some sort gained a positive learning experience from participation in the project. A minority of respondents (25%) did not blatantly identify learning in their answers to Question 12. For example, one of these participants observed that “the city is trying” while another confessed they didn’t know if what they said would be taken under consideration. A third respondent stated their opinion that the Community Design Workshop was “creative and interesting” and the fourth ‘No Learning’ participant commented “I was only interested in protecting the ESA.” None of these responses conformed to the categories of learning devised by the author – and derived from the literature review - prior to conducting this study. See Table 2, Appendix C.

Since a majority of respondents (75%), and far more than one-third of participants, either reported learning about the processes of local government (50%) or other types of lessons (25%), Hypothesis 2 is accepted. In accordance with the author’s prediction, perceived levels of engagement did not appear to significantly influence whether respondents learned from participating in the Process, as all of the unengaged participants (12%) expressed learning of some form and both engaged (13%) and very engaged (13%) respondents identified no learning (See Table 2, Appendix C). Likewise, views toward government did not seem to affect whether participants learned from their participation in the project because the single respondent with a negative opinion of government claimed to have learned from the Process while participants with neutral or positive views toward government professed no learning. See Table 4, Appendix C2.

Chapter 6 - Generalizations and Implications for Theory

To Summarize, this paper has confirmed both hypotheses by demonstrating a notable relationship between respondents' perceived level of engagement in the MSP project and satisfaction with the public participation process. The analysis found that, by merely participating, citizens learned about the processes of municipal government and acquired other types of lessons, irrespective of their level of involvement in the project and views toward government. These findings are congruent with existing literature that illustrates that purposeful citizen engagement in local government can foster favourable views among citizens toward the public participation process and can generate learning with regard to the processes and responsibilities of local government, as well as other forms of learning. Consistent with recent studies that endorse meaningful citizen engagement at the local level, and in keeping with the NPS theory of public administration, this research paper concludes that the facilitation of public participation in municipal government is indeed a worthwhile objective. Despite the fact that the MSP Process facilitators did not manage to convince most of the survey respondents that their opinions were seriously contemplated and will impact the substantive content of the Secondary Plan, and even though a plurality of participants were dissatisfied with the way the project, the facilitators successfully engaged the majority of respondents in a procedural sense. Furthermore, participants who were 'very engaged' in the Process tended to be satisfied with the way it was conducted, whereas half of the respondents who were 'unengaged' were dissatisfied with the project. Accordingly, this study found that a relatively strong statistical relationship exists between respondents' perceived level of engagement in the public participation process and their satisfaction with the exercise.

Therefore, citizens will likely find value in and be satisfied with the participation process if they are highly engaged in the project. This paper also discovered that public engagement in local governance is effective at producing citizen learning with respect to the processes of municipal government and other types of lessons, and is thus valuable in that regard. However, because of the small sample size of the study, the findings of this paper must be interpreted as exploratory research that can be used to generate hypotheses to be more fully tested by additional research.

Appendix A – Questionnaire (Citizens)

In the question below, please check the answer that best describes your involvement in the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process.

1. I participated in the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process by:

- Attending the Public Visioning Session in February 2010
 - Attending the Community Design Workshop in April 2010
 - Attending both the Public Visioning Session and Community Design Workshop
 - I did not participate in the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process
-

With respect to your experience in the Process, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the statements below.

2. I received adequate opportunities to express my views.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

3. When called upon to speak, I could openly state my honest opinion.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

4. My viewpoints were seriously considered by the Process facilitators (city staff members & consultants).

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

5. My written input and/or verbal comments will likely influence the content of the Secondary Plan.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

6. My interests will likely be reflected in the Secondary Plan.

- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
-

In the following questions, please check the ONE answer that applies to you.

7. Are you male or female?

- Male
- Female

8. What is your approximate age?

- Under 15 years old
- 15-35 years old
- 36-55 years old
- 56-75 years old
- 76-95 years old
- Over 95 years old

9. Which ethnicity do you identify with?

- Aboriginal (e.g. Inuit, Métis, North American Indian)
- Arab/West Asian (e.g. Armenian, Egyptian, Iranian, Lebanese, Moroccan)
- Black (e.g. African, Haitian, Jamaican, Somali)
- Chinese
- Filipino
- Japanese
- Korean
- Latin American
- South Asian
- South East Asian
- White (Caucasian)
- Other

10. Putting aside your experience in the Meadowlily Secondary Plan Process, which statement best reflects your overall opinion of government?

- Government plays a positive role in the lives of citizens
 - Government has a detrimental impact on society
 - Neutral/No Opinion
-

For the question below, please indicate your level of satisfaction.

11. How satisfied are you with the way the Process was conducted?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

Please answer the following question in your own words.

12. What, if anything, did you learn from participating in the process?

Appendix B – Participation Index¹

A) The author assigned values to each response:

Questionnaire Item 2 (QI2): I received adequate opportunities to express my views.

Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1)

QI3: When called upon to speak, I could openly state my honest opinion.

Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1)

QI4: My viewpoints were seriously considered by the MSP facilitators (city staff & consultants)

Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1)

QI5: My written input and/or verbal comments will likely influence the content of the Plan.

Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1)

QI6: My interests will likely be reflected in the Plan.

Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1)

B) Responses to the statements in Questionnaire Items 2-6 were totaled to determine the respondent's perceived level of engagement in the MSP process.

Values could have ranged from 5 (Unengaged) to 25 (Very Engaged).

C) Values were categorized as follows:

Unengaged: Scores 5-11

Engaged: Scores 12-18

Very Engaged: Scores 19-25

¹ Adapted from: O'Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner, 103.

Appendix B2 – Participation Index Results

Response	Attend	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Total	Level	Satisfaction
1	VS & CDW	4	4	4	4	3	19	VE	Satisfied
2	VS & CDW	4	4	4	4	3	19	VE	Satisfied
3	VS & CDW	5	5	4	4	4	22	VE	Satisfied
4	VS	5	4	3	3	3	18	E	Satisfied
5	VS	3	4	2	3	3	15	E	Dissatisfied
6	VS & CDW	4	5	3	3	3	18	E	Dissatisfied
7	CDW	2	3	3	2	2	12	E	Dissatisfied
8	VS	4	4	3	3	3	17	E	Dissatisfied
9	VS & CDW	4	4	3	3	4	19	VE	Satisfied
10	VS & CDW	2	2	1	1	1	7	UN	Dissatisfied
11	VS & CDW	2	2	3	4	3	15	E	Dissatisfied
12	CDW	4	4	3	3	3	17	E	Neither
13	VS & CDW	4	5	4	3	4	20	VE	Satisfied
14	CDW	2	4	2	1	2	11	UN	Neither
15	VS & CDW	4	4	4	4	3	19	VE	Dissatisfied
16	CDW	5	5	5	5	5	25	VE	Satisfied

Where:

VS = Attended Public Visioning Session

CDW = Attended Community Design Workshop

Level = Respondent's Perceived Level of Engagement in MSP Process

Satisfaction = Respondent's Level of Satisfaction with MSP Process

Appendix C – Contingency Tables²

Table 1 (Hypothesis 1)

Perceived Level of Engagement in MSP Process (IV)				
Satisfaction with MSP Process (DV)	Unengaged (%)	Engaged (%)	Very Engaged (%)	Total (N)
Dissatisfied	6	31	6	7
Neutral	6	6	0	2
Satisfied	0	6	38	7
Total (N)	2	7	7	16

Table 2 (Hypothesis 2)

Perceived Level of Engagement in MSP Process (IV)				
Citizen Learning from Participation in MSP Process (DV)	Unengaged (%)	Engaged (%)	Very Engaged (%)	Total (N)
No Learning or Response	0	13	13	4
Other	6	6	13	4
‘Processes’ of Local Government	6	25	19	8
Total (N)	2	7	7	16

² All tables adapted from: O’Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner, 396-413.

Appendix C2 – Contingency Tables (Controls)

Table 3 (Hypotheses 1 / Control)

Views toward Government (CV)									
Perceived Level Of Engagement In MSP Process	Anti-Gov't Satisfaction w/ MSP			Neutral Satisfaction			Pro-Government Satisfaction		
	Dissatisfied	(%) Neutral	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	(%) Neutral	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	(%) Neutral	Satisfied
Unengaged	6							6	
Engaged				13	6		19		6
Very Engaged						13	6		25
Total (N)	1			2	1	2	4	1	5

Table 4 (Hypothesis 2 / Control)

Views toward Government (CV)									
Perceived Level Of Engagement In MSP Process	Anti-Gov't Learning from MSPP			Neutral Learning			Pro-Government Learning		
	No Learning/Response	(%) Other Processes		No Learning/Response	(%) Other Processes		No Learning/Response	(%) Other Processes	
Unengaged			6						6
Engaged				6	6	6	6		19
Very Engaged					6	6	13	6	13
Total (N)			1	1	2	2	3	2	5

**Appendix D – Percentaged Cross Tabulation for Perceived Level of Engagement
and Satisfaction with MSP Process**

Table 5 (Hypothesis 1)

Perceived Level of Engagement in MSP Process (IV)

Satisfaction with MSP Process (DV)	Unengaged	Engaged	Very Engaged
Dissatisfied	50	71	14
Neutral	50	14	0
Satisfied	0	14	86
	(n = 2)	(n = 7)	(n = 7)

Appendix D2 – Value of Gamma (Strength of Relationship)

Table 6 (Hypothesis 1)

Perceived Level of Engagement in MSP Process (IV)				
Satisfaction with MSP Process (DV)	Unengaged	Engaged	Very Engaged	Total (N)
Dissatisfied	1	5	1	7
Neutral	1	1	0	2
Satisfied	0	1	6	7
Total (N)	2	7	7	16

Gamma

Concordant Pairs:

$(1 + 0 + 1 + 6 = 8)$ $(1 \times 8 = 8 \text{ pairs})$

$(0 + 6 = 6)$ $(5 \times 6 = 30 \text{ pairs})$

$(1 + 6 = 7)$ $(1 \times 7 = 7 \text{ pairs})$

(6) $(1 \times 6 = 6 \text{ pairs})$

Total = $8 + 30 + 7 + 6 = 51$ pairs

Discordant Pairs:

$(1 + 1 + 1 + 0 = 3)$ $(1 \times 3 = 3 \text{ pairs})$

$(1 + 0 = 1)$ $(5 \times 1 = 5 \text{ pairs})$

$(1 + 0 = 1)$ $(0 \times 1 = 0 \text{ pairs})$

(0) $(1 \times 0 = 0 \text{ pairs})$

Total = $3 + 5 + 0 + 0 = 8$ pairs

Gamma = $\frac{\text{Number of Concordant Pairs} - \text{Number of Discordant Pairs}}{\text{Number of Concordant Pairs} + \text{Number of Discordant Pairs}}$

$$\text{Gamma} = \frac{51 - 8}{51 + 8}$$

$$\text{Gamma} = \frac{43}{59}$$

$$\text{Gamma} = 0.73$$

- ⁱ The methodology for this section is based on the techniques outlined in: Elizabethann O' Sullivan, Gary R. Rassel, and Maureen Berner, *Research Methods for Public Administration* (5th Ed), New York, Pearson Longman, 2008, 472-491; and Kenneth J. Meier, Jeffery L. Brudney, and John Bohte, *Applied Statistics for Public and Non-Profit Administration*, New York, Thomson Wadsworth, 2009, 37-38.
- ⁱⁱ C. Richard Tindal and Susan Nobes Tindal, *Guide to Good Municipal Governance*, St. Thomas, Municipal World, 2007, 45.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Vivien Lowndes, "Citizenship and Urban Politics," in David Judge, Gerry Stoker, and Harold Wolman (Eds), *Theories of Urban Politics*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, 1995, 160.
- ^{iv} Ibid, 161.
- ^v Ibid.
- ^{vi} Quoted in: Ibid, 177.
- ^{vii} Geraint Parry, George Moyser, and Neil Day, *Political Participation and Democracy in Britain*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- ^{viii} David Prior and Kieron Walsh, *Citizenship and the Quality of Local Government*, Partnership Paper, Birmingham, Institute of Local Government Studies, 1993, 7.
- ^{ix} Peter John, "Can Citizen Governance Redress the Representative Bias of Political Participation?" *Public Administration Review*, 69, 3, 2009, 495.
- ^x Lowndes, 165-167.
- ^{xi} Ibid, 167.
- ^{xii} Cheryl King, Kathryn Feltey, and Bridget Susel, "The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration," *Public Administration Review*, 58, 4, 1998, 319.
- ^{xiii} Ibid.
- ^{xiv} Ibid, 320.
- ^{xv} Ibid, 319.
- ^{xvi} John B. Sutcliffe, "Public Participation in Local Politics: The Impact of Community Activism on the Windsor-Detroit Border Decision Making Process," *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17, 2, 2008, 63.
- ^{xvii} Ibid, 63-64.
- ^{xviii} Keith Culver and Paul Howe, "Calling All Citizens: The Challenges of Public Consultation," *Canadian Public Administration*, 47, 1, 2004, 57-64.
- ^{xix} Sutcliffe, 59.
- ^{xx} Culver and Howe, 62.
- ^{xxi} Martin Simard and Guy Mercier, "Planning, Participation and Identity in Quebec City: Community Building through Urban Revitalization," *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 10, 1, 2001, 28-29.
- ^{xxii} Lowndes, 163-164.
- ^{xxiii} Ibid, 162-163.
- ^{xxiv} Quoted in: Ibid, 163.
- ^{xxv} King, Feltey, and Susel, 322.
- ^{xxvi} John, 494-495.
- ^{xxvii} Kenneth Kernaghan, Brian Marson, and Sandford Borins, *The New Public Organization*, Toronto, The Institute of Public Administration Canada, 2000, 15-45.
- ^{xxviii} Ibid, 179-186.
- ^{xxix} Sutcliffe, 60.
- ^{xxx} Robert B. Denhardt and Janet Vinzant Denhardt, "The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering," *Public Administration Review*, 60, 6, 2000, 555.
- ^{xxxi} Ibid, 552.
- ^{xxxii} Ibid, 556-557.
- ^{xxxiii} King, Feltey, and Susel, 317.
- ^{xxxiv} Culver and Howe, 53.
- ^{xxxv} Lowndes, 166.
- ^{xxxvi} See: Ibid, and Richard C. Tindal and Susan Nobes Tindal, *Local Government in Canada* (7th Ed), Toronto, Nelson Education, 2009, 319.
- ^{xxxvii} King, Feltey, and Susel, 319-320.
- ^{xxxviii} Ibid, 320.
- ^{xxxix} Sutcliffe, 62.
- ^{xl} Cited in: Ibid.

-
- xli Cited in: Ibid.
- xlⁱⁱ Culver and Howe, 55.
- xlⁱⁱⁱ Ibid, 53.
- xl^{iv} Ibid, 70-71.
- xl^v Ibid.
- xl^{vi} Ibid, 59.
- xl^{vii} Ibid.
- xl^{viii} Ibid, 73.
- xl^{ix} Ibid, 76.
- ^l Ibid, 78.
- ^{li} Martin Simard and Guy Mercier, "Planning, Participation, and Identity in Quebec City: Community Building through Urban Revitalization," *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 10, 1, 2001, 23-28.
- ^{lii} Ibid, 29-30.
- ^{liii} Ibid, 31.
- ^{liv} Ibid, 33.
- ^{lv} Ibid, 32.
- ^{lvi} Ibid.
- ^{lvii} Ibid, 31-32.
- ^{lviii} Williams, 15.
- ^{lix} Ibid.
- ^{lx} Ibid, 15-16.
- ^{lxi} Ibid, 16.
- ^{lxii} Quoted in: Ibid.
- ^{lxiii} Ibid.
- ^{lxiv} Ibid, 73.
- ^{lxv} Quoted in: Ibid.
- ^{lxvi} Ibid, 74.
- ^{lxvii} Ibid.
- ^{lxviii} Archon Fung, *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004, 103.
- ^{lxix} Ibid, 109.
- ^{lxx} Ibid, 119.
- ^{lxxi} Ibid, 120.
- ^{lxxii} Quoted in: Ibid, 127.
- ^{lxxiii} Ibid, 71.
- ^{lxxiv} Ibid, 72.
- ^{lxxv} Ibid.
- ^{lxxvi} Ibid.
- ^{lxxvii} Ibid.
- ^{lxxviii} The methodology for this section is based on the techniques outlined in: O'Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner, 490, 15-16, 370-372; and Meier, Brudney, and Bohte, 3, 36-37, 188-190.
- ^{lxxix} As cited in: Sutcliffe, 62-64.
- ^{lxxx} Simard and Mercier, 23-39; Culver and Howe, 52-74; Sutcliffe, 57-79.
- ^{lxxxⁱ} Robert B. Denhardt and Janet Vinzant Denhardt, "The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering," *Public Administration Review*, 60, 6, 2000, 549-559.
- ^{lxxxⁱⁱ} Ibid, 552-553.
- ^{lxxxⁱⁱⁱ} Quoted in: Ibid, 554.
- ^{lxxx^{iv}} The methodology for this section is based on the techniques outlined in: O'Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner, 494, 25-45, 134-150; and Meier, Brudney, and Bohte, 43-45.
- ^{lxxx^v} "Notice of Project Commencement: Meadowlily Secondary Plan and Municipal Class Environmental Assessment," *City of London*, Online, <http://www.london.ca/Reference_Documents/MeadowlilyNoticeCommencement.pdf>.
- ^{lxxx^{vi}} Quoted in: Ibid.
- ^{lxxx^{vii}} Quoted in: Ibid.

- lxxxviii “Staff Report to Planning Committee OZ-7430,” *City of London*, Online, 30 Sep. 2008, <http://www.london.ca/Planning_and_Development/PDFs/Area_Plans/OZ7430_Planning_Committee_Report.pdf>.
- lxxxix Ibid.
- xc Ibid.
- xci Ibid.
- xcii Jonathan Sher, “Residents Battling Wal-Mart Win Round,” *The London Free Press*, 2 Oct. 2008, A1.
- xciii “Council Resolution for OZ-7430,” *City of London*, Online, 21 Oct. 2008, <http://www.london.ca/Planning_and_Development/PDFs/Area_Plans/meadow_Council_res_OZ-7430.pdf>.
- xciv Jim Prentice, Federal Minister of the Environment, personal communication (letter) to Ed Holder, Member of Parliament for London West, 14 Apr. 2009, obtained via City of London Planning and Development Department on 20 Jul. 2010.
- xcv Irene Mathysen, Member of Parliament for London Fanshawe, personal communication (letter) to Jeff Cuthbert, Friends of Meadowlily Woods, 8 Jan. 2009, obtained via City of London Planning and Development Department on 20 Jul. 2010.
- xcvi See: Ibid; and “Council Resolution for OZ-7430.”
- xcvii See: “Staff Report to Planning Committee OZ-7430”; and “Council Resolution for OZ-7430.”
- xcviii “Council Resolution for OZ-7430.”
- xcix Friends of Meadowlily Woods, personal communication (letter) to City of London Planning and Development Department, 23 Feb. 2010, obtained on 20 Jul. 2010.
- c “Council Resolution for OZ-7430.”
- ci Ibid.
- cii See: Ibid; and “Staff Report to Planning Committee OZ-7430.”
- ciii Ibid.
- civ Ibid.
- cv “Staff Report to Planning Committee OZ-7430.”
- cvi “Council Resolution for OZ-7430.”
- cvii Ibid.
- cviii “Meadowlily Community Design Workshop – Summary of Comments and Concepts,” *City of London*, Online, 27 Apr. 2010, <http://www.london.ca/Planning_and_Development/PDFs/Area_Plans/Meadowlily_Comments_2010-04-27.pdf>.
- cix Ibid.
- cx “Notice of Project Commencement: Meadowlily Secondary Plan and Municipal Class Environmental Assessment.”
- cxii “Public Meeting #1: Public Information and Visioning Session – Compiled Stakeholder Comments,” *City of London*, Online, 10 Feb. 2010, <http://www.london.ca/Planning_and_Development/PDFs/Area_Plans/MeadowlilyVisioningSession_CompiledStakeholderComments.pdf>; and “Meadowlily Community Design Workshop – Summary of Comments and Concepts.”
- cxiii Ibid.
- cxiv Ibid.
- cxv Ibid.
- cxvi Ibid.
- cxvii Ibid.
- cxviii “Meadowlily Community Design Workshop – Summary of Comments and Concepts.”
- cxix Ibid.
- cxx Ibid.
- cxxi Lowndes, 167.
- cxxii See: “Public Meeting #1: Public Information and Visioning Session – Compiled Stakeholder Comments.”

^{cxxiii} Culver and Howe, 56.

^{cxxiv} The methodology for this section is based on the techniques outlined in: O’Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner, 101-128, 212-243; and Meier, Brudney, and Bohte, 14-28, 533-542.

^{cxxv} The methodology for this section is based on the techniques outlined in: O’Sullivan, Rassel, and Berner, 323-357; and Meier, Brudney, and Bohte, 239-313.

^{cxxvi} “Public Meeting #1: Public Information and Visioning Session – Compiled Stakeholder Comments.”

^{cxxvii} Ibid.

^{cxxviii} “Meadowlily Community Design Workshop – Summary of Comments and Concepts.”

^{cxxix} Ibid.

Bibliography

- “Council Resolution for OZ-7430.” *City of London*. Online. 21 Oct. 2008.
<http://www.london.ca/Planning_and_Development/PDFs/Area_Plans/meadow_Council_res_OZ-7430.pdf>.
- Culver, Keith, and Howe, Paul. “Calling All Citizens: The Challenges of Public Consultation.” *Canadian Public Administration*. 47. 1. 2004: 52-75.
- Denhardt, Robert B., and Denhardt, Janet Vinzant. “The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering.” *Public Administration Review*. 60. 6. 2000: 549-559.
- Judge, David, Stoker, Gerry, and Wolman, Harold (Eds). *Theories of Urban Politics*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1995.
- King, Cheryl, Feltey, Kathryn, and Susel, Bridget. “The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration.” *Public Administration Review*. 58. 4. 1998: 317-325.
- “Meadowlily Community Design Workshop – Summary of Comments and Concepts.” *City of London*. Online. 27 Apr. 2010.
<http://www.london.ca/Planning_and_Development/PDFs/Area_Plans/Meadowlily_Comments_2010-04-27.pdf>.
- Meier, Kenneth J., Brudney, Jeffery L., and Bohte, John. *Applied Statistics for Public and Non-Profit Administration*. New York: Thomson Wadsworth, 2009.
- “Notice of Project Commencement: Meadowlily Secondary Plan and Municipal Class Environmental Assessment.” *City of London*. Online. Visited 20 Dec. 2009.
<www.london.ca/Reference_Documents/MeadowlilyNoticeCommencement.pdf>
- O’ Sullivan, Elizabethann, Rassel, Gary R., and Berner, Maureen. *Research Methods for Public Administration* (5th Ed). New York: Pearson Longman, 2008.
- Parry, Geraint, Moyser, George, and Day, Neil. *Political Participation and Democracy in Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Prior, David and Walsh, Kieron. *Citizenship and the Quality of Local Government* (Partnership Paper). Birmingham: Institute of Local Government Studies, 1993.
- “Public Meeting #1: Public Information and Visioning Session – Compiled Stakeholder Comments.” *City of London*. Online. 10 Feb. 2010.
<http://www.london.ca/Planning_and_Development/PDFs/Area_Plans/MeadowlilyVisioningSession_CompiledStakeholderComments.pdf>.

-
- Sher, Jonathan. "Residents Battling Wal-Mart Win Round." *The London Free Press*. 2 Oct. 2008: A1 & A3.
- Simard, Martin and Mercier, Guy. "Planning, Participation and Identity in Quebec City: Community Building through Urban Revitalization." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*. 10. 1. 2001: 23-40.
- "Staff Report to Planning Committee OZ-7430." *City of London*. Online. 30 Sep. 2008. <http://www.london.ca/Planning_and_Development/PDFs/Area_Plans/OZ-7430_Planning_Committee_Report.pdf>.
- Sutcliffe, John B. "Public Participation in Local Politics: The Impact of Community Activism on the Windsor-Detroit Border Decision Making Process." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*. 17. 2. 2008: 57-83.
- Tindal, Richard C. and Tindal, Susan Nobes. *Local Government in Canada* (7th Ed). Toronto: Nelson Education, 2009.