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Executive Summary

Cities have long been considered very physical expressions of social relations, movements, and ideologies, so it stands to reason that physical change can provide some insight into broader political change – neoliberalism being one example – that converge to produce and reproduce everyday urban life. Unfortunately, the connection between urban form and neoliberalism is ignored...  

- Hackworth 2007, p. 79.

This report aims to bridge the gap between the sociopolitical landscape and the physical landscape of every day urban life. The urban landscape, particularly the urban waterfront, is a contested site where different forces – the political, the social, and the physical - come together to produce change. Processes like public participation highlight the power and potential for cities to develop under principles that are not predetermined, despite the clout of neoliberal dominance and normalcy. Through the effective management and realization that there are a variety of interactions, movements and ideologies that influence urban form and everyday urban life, the dynamic nature of a city is revealed. This report is a critique towards the ‘monolithic city’.

The Bedford Waterfront Development (BWD), located in Bedford, Nova Scotia, Canada, is used as a case study in order to support this critique. Specifically, this case study asks the following: given the neoliberal paradigm of the Bedford Waterfront Development, what challenges, limitations, and constraints – and even opportunities – exist for the public in the planning decision making process? By critically evaluating the BWD’s public consultation process this report addresses the different ways in which the Bedford community’s voice was heard under a neoliberal waterfront planning framework.

The objectives of the report required two distinct evaluation frameworks: 1) to explain why the BWD is neoliberal and, 2) to assess the quality of the BWD visioning and public consultation programs. The first was done in order to situate the BWD project within the context of the larger sociopolitical structure of our time - that being neoliberalism. As Jason Hackworth explains, “neoliberalism is everywhere and, apparently, everything” (2007, p. xii). As such, the following table was created in order to evaluate and justify the reasoning that the BWD is a neoliberal development. The table describes the neoliberal characteristics to which the BWD clearly identifies with:
CHARACTERISTICS OF A NEOLIBERAL DEVELOPMENT:
THE BEDFORD WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Factor</th>
<th>Theoretical Foundation</th>
<th>BWD Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial: ‘The Public-Private Partnership’</td>
<td>Urban regime; planning hierarchy; private investment vs. public good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>The Spatial Fix: ‘The Mega-Project’</td>
<td>Centralized urban locale; long-term economic investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Uneven Development: ‘Corporatized Gentrification’</td>
<td>Affluent users;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Alternatives</td>
<td>Hegemonic Power: ‘The TINA Syndrome’</td>
<td>Hegemonic dominance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second evaluative framework is a more technical and stringent criteria established by Rowe & Frewer (2000). Their model was used to assess the levels of public participation within the primary methods used for the BWD consultation process.

RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION TECHNIQUES USED IN THE BEDFORD WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance Criteria</th>
<th>Public Hearings</th>
<th>Citizen Advisory Committee</th>
<th>Public Opinion Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness of participants</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of true participants</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early involvement?</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on final policy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of process to public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the results of this analysis, the criterion for public hearings has a variant score overall, whereas the public opinion survey has scored generally low overall. What is significant and interesting is that the Citizen Advisory Committee scored a consistent ‘high’ across all acceptance criteria.
It was concluded that despite the variable differences amongst the scoring of the BWD participation methods, the participation process was nonetheless helpful in contributing to a fuller understanding of the ways in which more flexible, innovative, and community driven planning processes can engage in waterfront development in neoliberal times.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Context

Planners regularly include the public throughout the different stages of a planning process; however, the end result of a project often leads some to question the efficacy of community involvement. Therefore, planners need to evaluate the importance of public and community input in planning decision-making in order to create and influence effective partnerships between communities and planning authorities and to, possibly, identify alternative planning ideas. This is becoming increasingly important in a time when neoliberal policy trends are quickly becoming the dominant norm, and the voices of those less powerful are being silenced.

What began as a political ideology for governance and policy has in fact become a spatial process in and of itself; in other words, neoliberalism explains how the role of private investors and credit-rating agencies have come to (literally) shape public investments in the city (Hackworth 2007). Beginning in the late 1980s local politicians sought to position themselves more competitively in the twenty-first century’s version of a global economy; economic growth agendas, thusly, began to dominate local political landscapes (Desfor 2004, p. 493). And, while economic policies took priority, public opinion was often left to the wayside. In this regard, neoliberal trends and “globalization results from increasing spatial distantiation reflected in the growing spatial reach” (Jessop 2002, p.112) of politics, people, and their lived environment. Neoliberalism’s economic mechanisms, as well as its historical and political processes, have been reflected and translated into the very form and function of urban spaces: neoliberalism has manifested in all areas of the city, including the physical and ideological spaces of the public.

This report will look at waterfront development processes that, at the end of the twentieth century “were characterized by globalized and market driven accumulation processes” (Desfor 2004, p. 480), and that revolved “around the idea of functionality for the ruling class and the containment of (formerly) progressive approaches” (Scharenberg & Bader, 2009). The transformation of old seaports and other waterside industrial areas into places for the affluent largely reflects this idea. Additionally, urban political theory suggests
that urban waterfront revolution may only result from a ‘civic cooperation’ – “that is an informal arrangement by which public bodies and private interests function together in order to be able to make and carry out governing decisions” (Desfor 2004, p. 480). The urban waterfront, therefore, provides a good example of where neoliberalism has been exemplified, and where public participation in planning processes is always a contested subject. This report will examine these waterfront development trends in relation to Bedford, Nova Scotia, Canada – the focus area of this report.

1.2 The Bedford Waterfront Development

Bedford is a small, mostly residential community located on the shores of the Bedford Basin at the end of the Halifax Harbour. Incorporated as a town in 1980, and then amalgamated with the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) in 1996, Bedford still maintains a strong sense of community and identity. To date, Bedford has a population of no more than 17,000 residents, although current growth and expected future growth over the next decade is estimating and additional 35,000 Bedford residents (Ekistics 2010, p. 6).
This potential massive influx of residents has forced the Bedford community to ask serious questions about how they see themselves in the coming decades in terms of community development and identity.

In 2006 the answering of this question was facilitated with the adoption of the HRM *Regional Municipal Planning Strategy* which targeted the Bedford Waterfront and Moirs' Pond area as lands designated as a ‘Suburban Local Centre’ (HRM 2006, p. 44). Figure 1.2 shows the different components of the Bedford waterfront lands designated for development. The Bedford Waterfront officially became the future focal point of the community. However, preliminary thoughts and planning ideas had surfaced in the early 1980s as to the potential of making the Bedford Waterfront the heart and cultural centre of the community. The following sections will outline the origins and history of the BWD

**FIGURE 1.2: BEDFORD WATERFRONT LAND DEVELOPMENT COMPONENTS**
project. Also, note that there is a detailed timeline of significant planning events presented in the Appendix A.

### 1.2.1 Phase One

In 1983 the Bedford Waterfront Development Corporation (BWDC) was incorporated with a mandate to “oversee the creation and long-term mixed use development of accessible waterfront lands along the Bedford shoreline” (Online, accessed Jan 11, 2011: http://www.halifax.ca/VisionHRM/BedfordWaterfront/WDCInfillProj.html). More specifically, according to HRM documents, the long-term goal of the BWDC was to

...promote the development of Bedford’s waterfront project area as an attractive year-round mixed-use urban waterfront area containing public spaces and activities with residential, commercial, cultural and institutional issues that when developed; emphasize the waterfront project area’s location, heritage and environment (VisionHRM 2007, p. 3).

Moreover, as a part of the BWDC’s strategy, another objective was to determine the most feasible location for waterfront land infill via the deposit of slate from nearby excavations. Studies determined that the Mill Cove area was the most suitable landfill site due to both its shallow depths and its accessibility of land. Combined with the existing natural waterfront land, it was estimated that the new infilled site would provide over 60 acres of waterfront development lands (http://www.halifax.ca/VisionHRM/BedfordWaterfront/WDCInfillProj.html). The BWDC was then commissioned by the provincial government to prepare a long term waterfront development plan.

Completed and approved in 1985, the original BWDC waterfront development plan designated the future infilled land to be developed over two long-term phases: Phase 1 and Phase 2. Work on Phase 1 began in 1987 and is almost entirely completed. Phase 1 encompasses 25 acres of land, and consists of a high density residential development, DeWolfe Park, and the beginnings of a small commercial development to the south.

---

1 Pyretic Slate Disposal: “At this time, the issue of identifying a safe disposal site for pyretic slate arose. Pyretic slate is naturally occurring within the Halifax geological formation, and is acid bearing when exposed to both water and air. Environmental studies were completed prior to 2000 and demonstrated that using pyretic slate as ocean fill was environmentally sound. (The Phase Two area of the BWD was) identified as being both a practical and safe site to submerge and place this slate.”

It should also be noted that following the 1996 amalgamation of the HRM, the development of the Bedford Waterfront came under the jurisdiction of the Waterfront Development Corporation Limited (WDC), a provincial crown corporation (Ekistics 2010, p. 9). By 2001, the remainder of Phase 1 developments and the entirety of the Phase 2 project became the mandate of the WDC.

**FIGURE 1.3: FINAL CONSTRUCTION OF PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT LANDS**

![Figure 1.3: Final construction of Phase 1 development lands](source: Author's own collection, Dec 2010)

### 1.2.2 Phase Two

Phase 2 of the project is only in its initial infrastructural stages of development. In fact, Phase 2 lands are still being infilled with an expected additional 16 acres of land to be created (Online, accessed January 11, 2011: [http://www.halifax.ca/VisionHRM/BedfordWaterfront/WDCInfillProj.html](http://www.halifax.ca/VisionHRM/BedfordWaterfront/WDCInfillProj.html)). Figure 1.4 shows the Phase 2 lands currently undergoing the infill process. In the meantime, Phase 2 of the BWD project has undergone intensive planning and public engagement initiatives to determine what the future layout, usage, and community impression of the development will look like.

The foundation for this stage of the planning process is laid out in the HRM’s community involvement initiatives. As such, the BWD is rooted in VisionHRM, a pilot program that was introduced as a part of the HRM *Regional Municipal Planning Strategy*...
(2006). VisionHRM is a community visioning process\(^2\) intended on allowing a community to “determine its own priorities; priorities which will guide the community into the future” (HRC “Community Visioning Pilot Project” 2006, p. 2). Through VisionHRM, the BWD was selected as one of three pilot locations, and is to this day is still operating under the VisionHRM umbrella.

This report will analyze and evaluate the evolution of the BWD planning process under the HRM community visioning process. Commissioned by HRM, this process also incorporated the consulting firm, Ekistics Planning and Design, to provide both the technical assistance and to coordinate the public visioning strategies. Similarly, a Vision Implementation Committee (VIC) was established to act as the community’s voice.

\(^2\) ‘Community visioning’, as is defined by the HRM, means “a process of identifying, developing and documenting vision and values, leading towards strategy and tactics” (VisionHRM 2007, p. 7). The process requires the participation and input from community stakeholders.
throughout the planning process. Since its inception in 2006, VisionHRM has guided Phase 2 planning through a series of public hearings, charrettes, and visioning sessions, among many other community outreach strategies, with the goal of producing an official, publically influenced final planning strategy for the future development of the Bedford Waterfront. The process was realized in June of 2010 with the publication and presentation of the *Bedford Waterfront Design Study: Final Report*.

As a cautionary point, it should be noted that for the purpose of this report, both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 planning developments are to be assumed to be operating within a neoliberal political and planning paradigm. Although determining the neoliberal nature of the BWD is important in order to understand the various challenges associated with public participation in planning, it is not the objective of this report to prove or disprove the socio-political landscape of the BWD. Nevertheless, for clarity purposes, this assumption will be made clear and explained in greater detail in Chapter Three of this report.

**1.3 Research Question and Objectives**

This report asks the following: *given the neoliberal paradigm of the Bedford Waterfront Development, what challenges, limitations, and constraints – and even opportunities – exist for the public in the planning decision making process?* Specifically, this report will identify how the Vision Implementation Committee acted as a valuable source of information for the HRM and planning professionals, as well as to seek out how effective this partnership was in influencing the *Final Report* (2010 June) of the Phase II lands for the Bedford Waterfront.

This report will study and critically evaluate the Bedford Waterfront Development’s public consultation process in order to better understand the role of the public in waterfront planning decision making. The report will focus on the consultation program established between the Bedford Waterfront Community VIC and the members of the Waterfront Development Corporation Limited. The report will evaluate the different ways in which the Bedford community’s voice was heard under a neoliberal waterfront planning framework.
1.4 Summary of Methods

This report follows qualitative research methods. The nature of the research topic suggests a need for an exploratory study. In this way the researcher seeks to build knowledge in an area where there is currently little firm information or data. This implies that very little has been written on the subject, and the researcher seeks to build an understanding based on what is read and observed (Creswell 2009, p. 14). Additionally, this exploratory study intends to “formulate more precise questions that may be dealt with in future research” (Neuman 2000). For this undertaking, the primary mode of data collection was document review, and the analysis followed was augmented by the critical examination of theoretical literature.

Key data sources include Ekistics’ Bedford Waterfront Design Study: Final Report (2010) – herein after referred to as the Final Report - and their Bedford Waterfront Plan Options Report (June 2009), as well as other VisionHRM public consultation documents and VIC meeting minutes. The HRM official website has proved to be the hub of data collection and a valuable source for resourcing. Arnstein (1969) and Rowe & Frewer (2000) provide the theoretical literature and evaluation frameworks for assessing public consultation techniques, and Hackworth (2007) and Desfor (2003) provide the theoretical base for understanding the neoliberal context of the BWD. The results from the data analysis have been grouped into main themes and evaluated accordingly in order to fulfill the objectives of the report.

It should be understood, however, that this report is not a study of neoliberal theory, nor an analysis of whether or not the BWD is neoliberal. The study of this literature helps to establish a better understanding of the context for which the BWD public consultation process is operating. Additionally, this report is not a ‘best-practices’ waterfront planning case study. Rather, this report is a study of the public consultation process set up against the established evaluation criteria. Lastly, as the actual development project is still ongoing, this research is limited to the study and evaluation of the public consultation documents from February 2007 to June 2010, when the final draft of the BWD
plan was proposed and presented to the Bedford community. This will focus the analysis to the BWD planning process that included VisionHRM principles.

1.5 Report Organization

The subsequent chapter, Chapter Two, outlines the research methods and the various evaluation criteria used for assessing the efficacy of public involvement in the planning process. Chapter Three, addresses the theoretical basis that this report will follow. Because there is a high level of theoretical analysis in this report, it will be important to explain the reasoning behind certain theories, and to justify particular inferences made throughout the report.

Chapter Four presents the research findings. More precisely, this chapter shows how document analysis was used in a case study framework to fulfill the objectives of the report. The BWD planning process is explored in depth, and the public visioning recommendations are highlighted. The next chapter, Chapter Five, analyzes the findings from the previous chapter based on the report’s evaluation criteria. It is here where the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of the BWD public consultation process are identified.

The last chapter, Chapter six, offers some insights and concluding remarks regarding urban waterfront public consultation practices within a neoliberal paradigm. Specific reference is made to the HRM and the BWD. Furthermore, some suggestions are made that may help to guide future research on a similar subject.
Chapter 2: Research Methods

2.1 Introduction

The report is an exercise in qualitative research. Specifically, this chapter describes the methods used to address the research question: *given the neoliberal paradigm of the Bedford Waterfront Development (BWD), what challenges, limitations, and constraints – and even opportunities – exist for the public in the planning decision making process?* Two methods have been explored in the research – document review and site observation – and this chapter demonstrates how the two approaches were outlined and analyzed against the established evaluation criteria. Additionally, this chapter shows how critical analysis of planning documents can be augmented by theoretical literature, within a case study framework, in order to support the research objectives. The limitations of the methodology are highlighted in the final section of this chapter.

2.2 Qualitative Research

The flexible and descriptive nature of qualitative research is appropriately suited to the requirements of this report. Two aspects of qualitative methods relevant to this study are that all perspectives are valuable, and that all settings and people are worthy of study (Taylor & Bogdan 1984). Both planners and community residents were solicited for their opinion and views about the Community Visions Program. It was believed that their different perspectives on the effectiveness of particular planning strategies would contribute to developing insights into the public consultation processes (Lee 2002, p. 45). As such, a 'case study' approach was selected as a fitting research design.

The case study research method is used in many situations to “contribute to our knowledge of individual, group, organizational, social, political, and related phenomena” (Yin 2009, p. 4). By focusing on a particular case or example – the BWD public consultation program - the case study method “allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events such as...small group behaviour, organizational and managerial processes, (and) neighborhood change” (Yin 2009, p. 4). These qualities have allowed the researcher to incorporate multiple sources of data and different analytical
approaches, coupled with theoretical literature examination, to come to a better understanding of the research question.

2.2.1 Document Review Approach

The primary method for data collection and analysis was document review. As is the case for most case studies, documents provided specific details to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources, and allowed, for descriptive purposes, particular inferences on the topic (Yin 2009, p. 103). Two types of documentation were consulted: planning documents and theoretical literature (the details of each are listed in section 3.3). First, the analysis of planning documents and reports were used to gather information about the case, and to provide evidence and rationale for the results of the evaluation. Secondly, the review and analysis of the theoretical literature provided the basis for the evaluation criteria. Relying on theoretical propositions is a common and preferred strategy for guiding case study analysis (Yin 2009, p. 130).

2.2.1.1 Evaluation Framework

The objectives of the report required two distinct evaluation frameworks: 1) to explain why the Bedford Waterfront Development (BWD) is neoliberal and, 2) to assess the quality of the BWD visioning and public consultation programs. The following will review and explain the evaluation criteria established for each objective.

2.2.1.1.1 Neoliberal City: Neoliberal Development

First, it was thought necessary to assess the BWD within the perspective of an urban social, and in many ways dominant, ideological system. This was done in order to situate the waterfront development project within the context of the larger sociopolitical structure of our time - that being neoliberalism. As Hackworth explains, “neoliberalism is everywhere and, apparently, everything” (2007, p. xii). Within the understanding that the Bedford Waterfront is in fact a neoliberal waterfront development, this report is able to make clear the constraining, limiting and even opportunistic features of the BWD’s public consultation process. This was done by reviewing theoretical urban literature and analyzing it against the planning documents of the BWD. The evaluation criteria for explaining why the BWD is
a local manifestation of neoliberalism were divided into four descriptive factors: governance, geography, demographics, and planning alternatives. Explained below, these four factors will then be discussed within the context of the BWD in the following chapter.

**TABLE 2.1: CHARACTERISTICS OF A NEOLIBERAL CITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Factor</th>
<th>Theoretical Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial: ‘The Public-Private Partnership’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>The Spatial Fix: ‘The Mega-Project’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Uneven Development: ‘Corporatized Gentrification’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Hegemonic Power: ‘The TINA Syndrome’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neoliberal governance has changed from egalitarian liberalism to a more entrepreneurial model of urban government (Hackworth 2007, p. 61). In this way, neoliberal governance functions more so as a general regime of funding and action on cities (McDonogh 2008, p. 388) instead of a system for liberal provisions. Desfor extends this idea in stating that the neoliberal agenda aims to cut government expenditures and liberate free market forces to promote economic growth (Desfor 2004, p. 488). Within this framework, the dominant governance trend at the local level has been the establishment of public-private partnerships. These ways of cooperating vary in form from city to city, however, “city governments are increasingly expected to serve as market facilitators, rather than salves for market failures” (Hackworth 2007, p. 61). Public-private partnership is one foundation of a neoliberal city.

The particular geography of a neoliberal development serves as the second foundation. In cities throughout the advanced capitalist world, real estate has become one of the most important vehicles for economic development (Fainstein 2005, p. 124). Hackworth contributes to this idea by suggesting that real estate “has become quasi-autonomous because cities and capital have become increasingly reliant on it as a sector independent of the rest of the regional economy” (Hackworth 2007, p. 77). The most significant developments of this sort are urban ‘mega-projects’. High profile, downtown (re)development spatial fix is a second foundation of a neoliberal city.
Gentrification is another important factor that determines how neoliberalism becomes localized. In the urban environment, gentrification largely acts as a window into larger processes of economic and social restructuring (Hackworth 2007, p. 124). Specifically, “corporatized gentrification” - the involvement of corporate real estate capital - acts as a means for uneven development (Hackworth 2007, p. 126). In other words, the development of property for the affluent is a third foundation of a neoliberal city.

The final evaluative component for describing a neoliberal city lies in the presence, or lack of suitable political or planning alternatives. Although neoliberalism is, as stated above, “seemingly everywhere and everything”, its local manifestations vary case-by-case, city-by-city. Therefore, political processes and planning agendas must be viewed in a way such that the dialectic of inclusion and exclusion for the factors listed above functions as an analytical tool for assessing the neoliberal state of the BWD. Hackworth follows the argument that the success of neoliberalism is built on the widespread belief that “there is no alternative” (TINA) (Hackworth 2007, p. 200). The final foundation of a neoliberal city is the TINA syndrome.

2.2.1.1.2 Consultation Analysis: The Public Stakeholder

The core of this report will address and evaluate the quality of the BWD’s public consultation process. This report explores the BWD visioning program reports and other public meeting documents. These data sources were analyzed and then assessed against the evaluation criteria established by both Arnstein (1969), and Rowe and Frewer (2000). This approach satisfies the research question and provides insights into the potential for both further research, as well as case specific recommendations. The following outlines the analytical frameworks used for assessing the public’s input in the planning decision making processes for the BWD.

The first set of evaluative criteria addresses the Ladder of Participation established by Arnstein (1969) in relation to the neoliberal paradigm of the BWD. Here we wish to assess where on the ladder the BWD consultation sits and why it sits there. Through the evaluation of planning reports and public consultation documents, this report will identify several of the limitations and constraints of the BWD as they pertain to the identified ladder ‘rungs’. This will be a brief analysis; yet, again, it will further explain and make clear
the complexities and difficulties of working with the public within a neoliberal development model.

**FIGURE 2.1: ARNSTEIN’S EIGHT RUNGS ON THE LADDER OF PARTICIPATION**

This implies increasing degrees of decision-making clout. Citizens can enter into partnerships that enable them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with power-holders. At the topmost rungs, have-not citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power.

Tokenism allows the have-nots to hear and to have a voice. But under these conditions they lack the power to insure that their views will be heeded by the powerful. When participation is restricted to these levels, there is no follow-through, no "muscle," hence no assurance of change.

The objective here is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to enable power-holders to "educate" or "cure" the participants.

**SOURCE: ARNSTEIN 1969**

The second set of evaluative criteria will look more into the public stakeholder analysis of the BWD consultation process. This analysis will be more technical and will follow the more stringent set of criteria established by Rowe and Frewer (2000). Again, the review of the relevant planning documents analyzed against the following criteria will provide the method for responding to the research question and objectives.

According to Rowe and Frewer, public participation “encompasses a group of procedures designed to consult, involve, and inform the public to allow those affected by a decision to have an input into that decision. In this analysis, ‘input’ is the key phrase, differentiating participation methods from other communication strategies” (2000, p. 6-7). Hence, in order to evaluate public input, there needs to be an assessment of the procedures
used to construct public participation. The effective construction and implementation of a procedure will be evaluated under what is known as ‘acceptance criteria’ (2000, p. 11). Table 2.2 will be used as the model to assess the levels of key aspects of the BWD public consultation process. Although it is suggested that it is important for the participation techniques to score well on all of the evaluation criteria, no claims are made about the relative importance of these.

**TABLE 2.2: EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION TECHNIQUES USED IN THE BEDFORD WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance Criteria</th>
<th>Public Hearings</th>
<th>Citizen Advisory Committee</th>
<th>Public Opinion Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness of participants</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of true participants</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early involvement?</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on final policy</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of process to public</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
<td>High/Moderate/Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE: ROWE AND FREWER 2000, P. 19**

*Criterion of Representativeness:* The public participants should comprise a broadly representative sample of the population of the affected public (2000, p. 12). The integration of a wide sample of participants would ensure a more diverse perspective into decision-making processes, and could improve the effectiveness of challenging the status quo.

*Criterion of Independence:* The participation process should be conducted in an independent, unbiased way (2000, p. 13). Although a certain level of bias is to be expected – and is in many ways a guarantee, at least on the individual level – the management of the participation process should come via a third party representative. This means that the managers and facilitators, as well as the public representatives, should be independent of any affiliation to the sponsoring body (2000).

*Criterion of Early Involvement:* The public should be involved as early as possible in the process as soon as value judgments become salient (2000, p. 14). This criterion also
concerns the frequency of involvement. Moreover, this is an important criterion for the sponsors such that their credibility may result from this process.

Criterion of Influence: The output of the procedure should have a genuine impact on policy (2000, p. 14). In this case, the research would like to demonstrate the extent to which the public’s input was represented in the final draft of the BWD planning report (Ekistics, June 2010).

Criterion of Transparency: The process should be transparent so that the public can see what is going on and how decisions are being made (Rowe and Frewer 2000, p. 15). Quite simply, the participation process should be made visible and available to the wider public so that they may be aware of what is going on, and what decisions are being made.

2.2.2 Site Observation Approach

As a second method, site observation was conducted. Ultimately, because a case study approach should take place in the natural setting of the ‘case’ (Yin 2009, p. 109), there was a unique opportunity for direct observation. The non-historical aspects of the research, such as the relevant environmental conditions, were readily available for observation. This stage of the research required the researcher to visit the study site, observe and document the setting and its surroundings, take relevant photographs, and document the stages of the BWD that have been completed or that are presently in progress. The scan of the site and the analysis of this data, thusly, helped in establishing an understanding of the current state of the BWD project for contextual and general background information purposes. Moreover, the researcher’s photographs and observations were used to assess whether or not any of the public’s input has been implemented thus far.

2.3 Data Collection and Research Precedents

The report is a single case study of the BWD in Bedford, Nova Scotia, Canada. As the development project is still ongoing at the time this report was conducted, the research was mostly limited to the study and evaluation of the public consultation documents from October 2007 to June 2010, when the final draft of the BWD plan was proposed and presented to the Bedford community. These documents include official reports and studies completed by the Halifax Regional Municipality; planning design concepts and public
workshop documents from Ekistics Planning and Design; planning reports from the Bedford Waterfront Commission; and the public consultation minutes and summaries produced by the VIC. Almost all of these data sources are available online.

Regarding the study of neoliberal theory and neoliberal planning practices, this research mostly focused on the urban theory presented by Gene Desfor (2003) and Jason Hackworth (2007). Additional theoretical resources were consulted, although the analytical substance was limited to these two authors. It should be understood, however, that this report is not a study of neoliberal theory, nor an analysis of whether or not the BWD is neoliberal. The study of this literature should only help to establish a better understanding of the context for which the BWD public consultation process is operating.

The evaluation framework for examining the public consultation process follows the criteria established by Sherry Arnstein, in her article *A Ladder of Citizen Participation* (1969), and Rowe and Frewer (2000). Arnstein’s article will mostly function as the key precedent and reference for analyzing the data. Furthermore, the combination of Arnstein’s *Ladder* with Hackworth’s and Desfor’s neoliberal theory forms the foundation for data analysis and evaluation. As a final clarification, it should be noted that this report is not a ‘best-practices’ waterfront case study. Instead, this report studies a public consultation process set up against an established evaluation criteria in order to gain insight into the various implications associated with public interest and waterfront planning.

### 2.4 Data Analysis

In order to ensure a quality report 1) validity 2) reliability and, 3) generalizability were all considered. The goal here was to minimize errors and bias. Firstly, in analyzing the data multiple sources of evidence were consulted. The use of multiple sources of evidence in case studies allows an investigator to address a wide range of historical and behavioral issues. (Yin 2009, p. 115) In this case the researcher incorporated the triangulation method – the use of planning documents, public consultation documents, and theoretical literature (expressed as the evaluation criteria) – to augment the quality of the study. Secondly and thirdly, the objective here was to ensure that, if a future researcher followed the same procedures in this report, future research would arrive at similar conclusions. For this case study, the researcher used reliable data sources and academic theoretical evaluation.
frameworks. Similar models have been used by Lee (2002) and Stasyna (2003). Case specific results may vary; nevertheless, the same research question could be answered following the procedure presented here.

2.5 Limitations

Unfortunately, there is no research design without limitations. Weaknesses of using a qualitative methodology - specifically a case study research design – include the inability to generalize from a sample to a population, and that they provide little scientific generalization (Yin 2009, p. 15). In other words, this case study is limited in generalizability to the theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. However, it was not the objective of this explanatory study to make universal generalizations about planning or public consultation. Broad generalization cannot be applied from this study because of the specific nature of the BWD. With that said, the identification of effective planning methods and public consultation programs based on the BWD’s experience may guide other researchers, planners or policy makers in communities that are experiencing comparable situations (Lee 2005, p. 62).

Another weakness of the study concerns the limited amount of data available. Because the BWD is still an ongoing project, there is concern that the data may be incomplete. Additionally, this report does not include any quantitative data or statistics. “Relying solely on a qualitative methodology often results in perceptions of non-validity; an analysis of purely qualitative data may produce weak results” (Lee 2005, p. 62). In an attempt to resolve these issues, the scope of the data has been limited to a particular timeframe to provide a particular context –October 2007 to June 16, 2010 - and multiple sources of qualitative data have been consulted to enhance the existing information.

There are also several limitations associated with the theory and typology of the analytical framework. Quite simply, however, it should be noted that theories and typologies are always changing and evolving. At present, the researcher believes these approaches to be the most significant and appropriate for the purposes of this report.

Lastly, as the researcher is from Bedford, N.S., there are concerns of personal bias. Particularly, the researcher has his own interests and ideas for the BWD plan. However, the goal of the report is to identify issues involved in the public consultation process; a field to
which the researcher has limited knowledge. Furthermore, the common tendency of researchers to become personally involved in their field setting – in this case the BWD – has been identified as a threat to the quantitative emphases on reliability and validity; it may also be argued that these same characteristics are possible strengths in qualitative methods (Lee 2005, p. 63). As noted by Mehra:

The outer world, or our ‘external reality’ is inseparable from what we already know based on our lives and experiences - our inner reality...the knowledge of the external world is only a small part of what our total knowledge can be; what we ever really know is, in essence, self. Thus, the reality we all see is based on our understanding of the world, which in turn is based on our knowledge of the self. (Mehra 2002)

The challenge then becomes the ability to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of personal bias, and to be critically self-reflexive in the analysis and interpretation of the data.

2.6 Conclusion

The limited amount of information available about the BWD consultation process and the fact that the BWD is an ongoing project suggests the need to incorporate qualitative methods. Qualitative methods include flexible and descriptive qualities, as well as the ability to make certain inferences, which made the case study approach very appealing. The incorporation of theoretical literature also contributes to the value of using a qualitative approach in conducting a case study of the consultation process informing the Bedford Waterfront Development.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

3.1 Introduction

Much of planning theory discusses what planners do with little reference to the sociospatial constraints under which they actually do planning (Fainstein 2005, p. 121). Urban waterfront planning theory must, then, address this theoretical weakness in order to connect context to outcome. This chapter introduces the theoretical concepts that will help guide this report. Because a large portion of the analysis section (Chapter 5) is dependent on the understanding of larger paradigmatic themes, the theories surrounding urban waterfront development, neoliberalism and public consultation will be highlighted in order to situate certain inferences within the context of the report’s objectives. This chapter will also assist the report by providing additional background information on the Bedford Waterfront Development project for further analysis. This chapter will demonstrate that the BWD is both operating within a neoliberal system at the same time that it is a neoliberal development, in and of itself, thus presenting unique challenges to the BWD’s consultation efforts.

3.2 Urban Waterfront Development Theory

According to Gordon (1996), the planning, designing and management of urban waterfront development projects should follow three important approaches: change the waterfront’s image; improve its accessibility; and, control the quality of the environment over the long term.

First, planners must know what is perceived as a public benefit and establish that early in the planning process; that way planners can show that the development is in the public interest (Gordon 1996, p. 265). Through public collaboration, planners can create a strong image for a waterfront development and garner consistent support. For example, when asked what role public collaboration played in a similar waterfront redevelopment project in the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM), the consultant developer replied:

Huge, huge - because if the public was against what we were doing or if the HRM was against what we were doing, we would be running into roadblocks.
What I think has happened because we really did put the underpinning in place was to get people on board right away. We’ve had no resistance. The worst thing a developer can have is resistance . . . from the public or different levels of government because that can slow you down and especially if you’ve already started to spend money. You know what makes the economics of development work is that once you start to spend money you start to get revenue quickly. So once you start to spend you want to make sure that all of your permits are in place because that is the last thing you want to slow you down. (Grant 2008, p. 527)

Once the public is on board with a project, simple design guidelines can ensure that a waterfront’s image is appropriate and used by people.

Second, by improving accessibility, urban design can change the ‘image of isolation’ (Gordon 1996, p. 273). In other words, development should not block public access for the benefit of private development. A simple way around this would be the construction of a good public walkway with immediate access to the water’s edge.

Finally, quality control in the physical environment over the long term implies the ability of developers to maintain and control the aesthetic quality of the physical environment throughout the duration of development (p. 275); this can be done in a number of ways. Gordon (1996) suggests a need for both a ‘phasing strategy’ and the use of multiple sites. Because urban waterfront developments may take decades to complete and require huge capital costs, phasing can allow for infrastructure to be extended on an incremental basis thus “minimizing its ‘construction site’ appearance” (p. 276). Additionally, having multiple development sites – or limiting parcel sizes within a plan – allows a number of different developers and architects to distribute the workload and integrate creative design, within the designated design guidelines.

The above mentioned planning approaches describe what are generally understood as ‘good’ urban waterfront planning principles. However, the question as to ‘why’ these are the generic standards lies in, as Fainstein would argue, “an underlying normative position” (Fainstein 2005, p. 124). The following will quickly review the structural power system from which urban waterfront planning is rooted.
3.2.1 Neoliberal Urban Theory

Neoliberalism refers to the multi-spatial (political, economic, social) hegemonic paradigm of our time. Loosely, it refers to the “policies and processes whereby a relative handful of private interests are permitted to control as much as possible of social life in order to maximize their personal profit.” (Chomsky 1999, p. 7) Within the practice of planning, the effects of neoliberalism have manifested into the ways in which a plan is prepared, perceived, and executed. Planners in the neoliberal city have tended towards a doctrine that minimizes the “capacity of agency to actually influence and transform existing power relations and thus the living conditions in and the prospect of cities.” (Scharenberg & Bader 2009, p. 326) Neoliberal urban norms have produced a system whereby both the physical form and public capacity of a city reflects the interests of the powerful.

3.2.2 The Neoliberal Urban Waterfront: The BWD

In order to justify the reasoning for the aforementioned statement that the BWD is a neoliberal development in and of itself, it will be necessary to evaluate the BWD in the context of the ‘descriptive factors’ presented and defined in Chapter Two.

Governance – In 2006 the HRM initiated its community visioning pilot project, VisionHRM. The project was established as a consultation tool appropriate for long-range planning in order to develop community planning priorities. (HRC 2006, p. 2) The BWD was identified as an area for VisionHRM implementation. Consultation for the BWD was to involve a collective of representatives from: the Mayor’s Office/Regional Council; the Community Council; a Community Liaison Group (CLG)\(^3\); community stakeholders; a Pilot Project Management Team; and professional firms such as: Ekistics Planning & Design; Colliers International; Atlantic Road & Traffic Management; Eastpoint Engineering Ltd.; Amec Ltd.; and, of course, the Waterfront Development Corporation Ltd (WDC). Hackworth calls this collective of private and public interests that join forces to initiate development an ‘Urban Regime’. (Hackworth 2007, p. 62)

---

\(^3\) According to the HRM, a CLG is to include representatives from a wide-range of community interests. It will bring a community ‘watch-dog’ perspective to the process and provide a core group of participants and contacts. This group also takes on priority setting, monitoring, and action roles after completion of the Vision. (HRC 2006, p. 9)
Hierarchical in nature, urban regimes filter priorities and economic goals through a series of governmental and private market agencies before ever reaching the ears of the public. Although most of the BWD lands are owned and operated by the Waterfront Development Corporation – a provincial crown corporation – the task of deciding what to do with these lands exactly has been delineated to other agents of capitalism such as private investors, for example. Private investors are thusly given the task of ensuring that development “balances public good with investment return for the landowners.” (Ekistics 2009, p. 2) The balance of benefits for public and private investment becomes a challenge under an urban regime.

*Geography* – Hackworth suggests that the post-1970 spatial fix has created a paradox in that there is both a “return of central-city real estate investment (and) urban sprawl has continued, if not accelerated” (Hackworth 2005, p. 486). Bedford - and the BWD more precisely – is uniquely caught up in this paradox. As suburban growth in Bedford seems to be expanding at an incredible rate\(^4\), the BWD is in and of itself the creation of, and an investment in a ‘central-city’. The HRM official plan identifies the BWD Mill Cove study area as a location for the creation of a new quasi-downtown ‘suburban locale’ (HRM 2006 August, p. 44). The details of the *Final Report* (2010) satisfy the spatial fix, ‘mega-project’ neoliberal criteria for a number of reasons.

The size and scope of the project clearly reflects a large-scale urban real estate investment. First, the development of the Bedford shoreline dates back to 1983 with the inception of the Bedford Waterfront Development Corporation (BWDC), with Phase 2 work projected to take additional 30 or more years of planning and build out. Specifically, the Phase 2 project has been broken down into four sub-phases with a corresponding long-term timeline. The details are presented below in figures 3.1 and 3.2. Second, the capital costs associated with Phase 2 developments are tremendous. Preliminary estimations for infrastructural costs alone range from $36M to $38M (Ekistics 2009, p. 33). All other costs associated with “public good and private investment, and new development with preserving the traditional vernacular of Bedford” (p.3) are done so in trying to balance cost

\(^4\) Facts and figures about Bedford’s expected growth rates...other developments that exemplify suburban growth/urban sprawl.
FIGURE 3.1: PHASE 2 DEVELOPMENT PHASING DIAGRAM

» Phase A: Moirs’ Village
» Phase B: Bedford Highway
» Phase C: Shore Drive
» Phase 2a: The Landing
» Phase 2b: The Canal
» Phase 2c: The Island

SOURCE: EKISTICS 2010, P. 98.
with revenue. This business-like attitude was reflected in a public hearing when a community member questioned “whether this ‘free land’ (assumedly public land) shouldn’t be made parkland and why not...lower the cost.” A representative from Colliers International – the firm responsible for market assessment – responded by saying “that the land is not free and the costs and revenues would have to be balanced” (HRM 2010, June 16, p. 4-5). Centralized, economically-driven real estate developments illustrate this neoliberal characteristic of the BWD.

Demographics – Hackworth suggests that when materialized at a highly localized level, gentrification can articulate even the broadest of “politico-economic forces like globalization, uneven development, and culture change. That is, gentrification can serve as a revealing window into much broader processes like neoliberalism.” (Hackworth 2007, p. 123) Therefore, continuing the discussion on urban waterfront real estate investment, the BWD planning designs and economic indicators largely reflect what Hackworth calls ‘corporatized gentrification’: the process by which local governments rely on large corporate real estate investments as a sector almost entirely independent of the rest of the regional economy. (Hackworth 2007, p. 77)

**FIGURE 3.2: PHASE 2 IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE**

5 “The implementation the phases A-C (Moirs’ Village, Shore Drive, and the Bedford Highway) can be carried out consecutively or concurrently, and should be completed at any time that development pressures, landowner intent, and demand warrant the build out. These are essentially stand-alone components of the overall plan, and while their implementation is a critical component of the development, the timing of build out is not intrinsically linked.” (Ekistics 2010, p. 97)
In 1990, the Bedford Waterfront Phase 1 Development resulted in a write-off of about $12 million by the province: “The cost (landfill, public amenities and infrastructure) significantly outweighed the revenue generated from post development land sales.” (Ekistics 2009, p. 2) The current project, Phase 2, is a considerably larger development than Phase 1 and will require more resources and corporate investment:

The initial estimates of cost for 35-40 acres of land created in phase 2 will be in the neighbourhood of $50 million 2009 dollars. This means that the Province must recoup over $1 million per acre to capitalize on the costs. If you consider that of the 35-40 acres, 20-30% will be taken up by parks and roads, the real value of the land could be in the $2 million range. (p. 2)

With over $200 million in private real estate investments (WDC online: https://www.my-waterfront.ca/about-wdcl) the WDC is very much in the business of making money. The costs and benefits must balance out. The Alternatives Options Report (2009) made several assumptions: one, for example, suggested that 2492 residential units at an average size of 1200 SF would need to be built in order to ensure the viability of the project. (Ekistics 2009, p.33) There is no misconception that waterfront properties are valued higher than those on the inland. The issue is not, then, whether the BWD is a development for the public, but rather, whether it is a development for the entire public. High real estate values will inevitably result in social exclusion such that a particular demographic is prioritized and localized. Real estate investment of this sort is arguably the leading edge of neoliberal urbanization at the local level (Hackworth 2007, p. 77) because it fosters uneven, gentrified development at the most local level.

Planning Alternatives - In essence, the assumption that ‘there is no alternative’ is neoliberalism’s most powerful message: “the notion that there can be no superior alternative to the status quo is more farfetched today than ever” (Chomsky 1999, p. 15). Hence, the subliminal nature of this syndrome makes this the most difficult criterion to formulate a concise understanding of how neoliberalism has manifested in the local context of the BWD. Alternatives to neoliberal planning, or lack thereof, will thusly, be explained throughout the following chapters of this report. In essence, this final descriptive factor highlights the main research question which sets out to understand the limitations and
potential opportunities for public engagement within the hegemonic neoliberal context. With that said, this report will return to this descriptive factor in a later chapter.

**TABLE 3.1: CHARACTERISTICS OF A NEOLIBERAL DEVELOPMENT: THE BEDFORD WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Factor</th>
<th>Theoretical Foundation</th>
<th>BWD Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial: ‘The Public-Private Partnership’</td>
<td>Urban regime; planning hierarchy; private investment vs. public good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>The Spatial Fix: ‘The Mega-Project’</td>
<td>Centralized urban locale; long-term economic investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Uneven Development: ‘Corporatized Gentrification’</td>
<td>Affluent users;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Alternatives</td>
<td>Hegemonic Power: ‘The TINA Syndrome’</td>
<td>Hegemonic dominance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, the BWD clearly identifies with three of the four descriptive factors that would make it a neoliberal development (see Table 3.1). The one unclear factor, “planning alternatives,” will be explored in detail in a later chapter. This was a simplified test primarily based on the literature analysis of Hackworth (2003, 2007); nevertheless, the exercise has demonstrated strong thematic similarities between neoliberalism and urban waterfront planning.

### 3.3 Public Consultation Approaches

Public consultation may take a variety of forms and functions within an urban planning context. Specifically, three participation methods have been identified within the VisionHRM public consultation strategies for the BWD. Table 3.2 lists these formalized methods and provides descriptions for each. Based on the literature review of BWD planning documents and VisionHRM preliminary objective reports, these were the most recurring and emphasized participation techniques. Throughout the report particular attention will be paid to the second method, ‘visioning’, as this method describes the role of the Community Liaison Group and Vision Implementation Committee.

---

A detailed timeline of the BWD public consultation approaches is presented in Appendix B
### TABLE 3.2: FORMALIZED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS USED IN THE BEDFORD WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Method</th>
<th>Nature of Participants</th>
<th>Time Scale/Duration</th>
<th>Characteristics/Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public hearings/inquiries</td>
<td>Interested citizens, limited in number by size of venue. True participants are experts and politicians making presentations.</td>
<td>May last many weeks/months, even years. Usually held during weekdays/working hours.</td>
<td>Entails presentations by agencies regarding plans in open forum. Public may voice opinions but have no direct impact on recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen/public advisory committee: ‘Visioning’</td>
<td>Small group selected by sponsor to represent views of various groups or communities (may not comprise members of true public).</td>
<td>Takes place over an extended period of time.</td>
<td>Group convened by sponsor to examine some significant issue. Interaction with industry representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion Survey</td>
<td>Large Sample (e.g., 100s or 1,000s), usually representative of the population segments of interest.</td>
<td>Single event, usually lasing no more than several minutes.</td>
<td>Often enacted through written questionnaire or telephone survey. May involve variety of questions. Used for information gathering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** ROWE AND FREWER 2000, P. 8-9

**Public Hearings/Inquires** – VisionHRM held numerous public hearings and other larger public engagement events with regards to the BWD from February 2007 to June 2010, and beyond. This report will evaluate a number of these events, although, the June 10, 2009 and June 16, 2010 public meetings will be emphasized.

**Citizen/public advisory committee: ‘Visioning’** – The main component of the BWD public participation process that satisfies this category is the Vision Implementation Committee (VIC), in its variety of forms. The evaluation of this Committee’s approach will be highly valuable in order to fulfill this report’s objectives.

---

7 “The Vision Implementation Committee (VIC) replaces the former Community Liaison Group (CLG) set up in 2007. The CLG guided the creation of the Vision for the Bedford Waterfront. The VIC and its Task Groups guide long-term implementation of the Vision. Following a recruitment drive in January 2008, other Bedford residents joined forces with returning CLG members to form the VIC and task groups.” (VisionHRM 2010, online: http://www.halifax.ca/visionhrm/bedfordwaterfront/VICMembersPage.html)
Public Opinion Survey – The most significant and influential survey was that administered by Ekistics on April 16, 2009. Ekistics was selected by the municipality to overseeing the visioning and design of the BWD in March of 2009. In order to gain initial public information one of Ekistics first priorities was to conduct this public opinion survey. The results of this survey are presented in Appendix C.

3.3.1 Citizen Participation Theory

*Planning theory needs to consider under what conditions conscious human activity can produce a better city... for all its citizens. Addressing such a question requires a constant concern with the interaction between planning procedures and outcomes.*

- Fainstein 2005, p. 127)

Perhaps building on the ideas of Sherri Arnstein (1969), Fainstein suggests that ‘citizen participation is citizen power’. Through citizen engagement and the interaction between the powers that be and the powers that are not, public participation can induce significant social reform, patronage, and shared benefits to society; effectively, citizen participation is the “redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future.” (Arnstein 1969, p. 217) Although, in the traditional sense of the expression it would not be reasonable to call Bedford citizen’s ‘have-nots’, the power of this idea still has merit. In order to best articulate the political-urban situation of the time, planners must be able to better understand the sociopolitical and economic forces from which all cities operate. Cities are contested sites, and people express their agency in a variety of ways. There is value in studying this philosophy.

3.4 Conclusion

Be it resolved that the BWD is a neoliberal development. The BWD’s public-private governance structure, its mega-urban spatial fix, its uneven social demographic qualities, and it’s seemingly ‘alternativeless’ characteristics makes for a neoliberal development. And, from within this understanding of the BWD, it is suggested that there is a need to study public participation techniques. The study of theory and its practical application to the public-urban setting will help planners better understand the links between the lived
experience and the unseen sociopolitical forces of the time. As we move into the following chapters of the report it will be important to consider these ideas, because the public participation events of the BWD are to be evaluated within the context of these theoretical understandings.
Chapter 4: Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the Bedford Waterfront Development (BWD) community visioning exercises conducted by VisionHRM. Community visioning for the BWD was conducted in two distinct phases: first, as demonstrated in Figure 4.2, the Community Liaison Group (CLG) engaged in goals and priorities setting which led to the Vision and Strategic Action Plan (2007); and, second, the Vision Implementation Committee (VIC) guided the vision’s implementation which led to the Final Report (2010). Working closely with Halifax Regional Municipality in order to implement the community's approved strategies, the VIC broke down into three task groups: transit, facilities & infrastructure planning, and environment. This chapter will focus on the second phase of visioning, however, some references and examples will be pulled from events prior to the Action Plan (2007). The results of these findings will qualify the various features of the BWD community visioning process into Rowe and Frewer’s dimensionless scoring tool presented in Chapter Two. This technique is used to highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of each BWD public participation method, and to assess the methods that were most effective in utilizing public participation.

FIGURE 4.1: CLG & VIC BACKGROUND (FROM THE PILOT PROJECT PHASE IN 2007)

From February 8th to July 5th the CLG held weekly meetings. Staff from the WDC and HRM attended each meeting. During this time the CLG designed and carried out a community visioning (engagement) process. A draft Vision and Action Plan was released on June 27th for public review. Over the summer all feedback was considered.

After 5 months of working to create a Vision and Action Plan for the Bedford Waterfront, the CLG concluded regular meetings on July 5, 2007.

The Vision and Action Plan was presented to Regional Council on October 30, 2007 and endorsed for implementation. A new community-based VIC was to guide the vision’s implementation. The VIC worked closely with HRM, Bedford residents and other stakeholders, agencies and levels of government.

4.2 Acceptance Criteria

An acceptance criterion refers to the specific indicator or measure used to assess the performance of each participation method’s function. To reiterate, the three formalized participation methods that will be evaluated in this chapter are: public hearings; a citizen advisory committee; and, a public opinion survey. Additionally, the five different acceptance criteria are: representativeness of participants; independence of participants; early involvement; influence on final policy; and, transparency of process to public. Each criterion will be explained respectively, in the context of the BWD public consultation process, prior to their evaluation against the three formalized public participation methods.

4.2.1 Representativeness of Participants

Methodologically, public representativeness is important for any governing body if it genuinely wishes to gauge the opinions of the general public. (Rowe & Frewer 2000, p. 13) However, practical constraints may limit this criterion’s implementation and
interpretation. In order to evaluate the quality of representativeness this report will primarily looking at two factors: sample size and the diversity of the participants. Both factors are important, although the interpretation of each is largely based on practical constraints such as the size of the venue and the ability of the researcher to fairly limit his own bias when examining different stakeholder interests. In other words, it would be ideal if the participants used for evaluation were representative of the broader public rather than some self-selected subset (p. 12), however, to fairly represent all stakeholders in the general public some bias seems likely.

4.2.1.1 Public Hearings

In remaining consistent with the characteristics of a public hearing identified in Table 3.2 (page 28 of this report), two public hearing events have been selected for evaluation of representativeness: the June 10, 2009 public information meeting that presented and sought feedback regarding the Bedford Waterfront Plan Options Report (Ekistics, June 2009); and, the June 16, 2010 public information meeting which presented and sought feedback regarding the Bedford Waterfront Design Study: Final Report (Ekistics, June 2010). These two events are presented as the most significant public hearing events for evaluation for the reason that they produced the two largest publications for the planning of the BWD to date.

First, when looking at the sheer size of each event, the public in attendance tallied approximately 150 (HRM June 10, 2009, p. 1) and 300 (HRM June 16, 2009, p.1) people respectively. These are large numbers, and they were especially appreciated when the Senior Planner from HRM Planning Services at the 2010 event vocalized that more people had showed up than expected (HRM June 16 [a]). Furthermore, the number of respondents at the meetings was relatively high with approximately 60 written comments submitted after the June 10, 2009 event. The quality of the sample size for public hearings is to be considered high.

Second, the diversity of the participants was well represented. Both events had a significant representation from HRM staff and the public. There were multiple senior planners from HRM, the Project Manager of the WDC, consultants from Ekistics and Colliers International, the Bedford Councillor and MLA, and members from the VIC. There are many
benefits to having a diverse staff at a public hearing. With an array of professional specialties, backgrounds and expertise, a diverse staff has the ability to provide logistical and technical knowledge with legitimacy and clout; however, there is also undoubtedly considerable bias from the ‘staff-perspective’ in that they are presenting material on a finalized process which they have all signed-off on. Nevertheless, the diversity of public opinion at each public hearing helped to dilute this bias. Both events devoted significant time (more than half of each two-plus hour event) to a question/comment period. Many of the public’s comments challenged staff perspective and encouraged people to think differently about the BWD. Many people stated that they felt “nervous” (HRM, June 16, 2010, p. 3) about the proposal, or that the “scope and scale” (p. 3) is unreasonable. Others simply challenged direct aspects of the plan; for example, one gentleman wondered - in spite of all the proposed residential development - “why a person could not work in Bedford as well” (p. 4). These simple acts of public debate and inquiry at the public hearings demonstrate a level of citizen agency that promotes diversity of opinion in a planning process. For this reason, the public hearing scores high on the evaluation criterion for representativeness.

FIGURE 4.3: JUNE 16, 2010 PUBLIC HEARING EVENT: BASINVIEW DRIVE COMMUNITY SCHOOL

SOURCE: BEDFORDBEACON.COM
4.2.1.2 Citizen Advisory Committee

See section 4.2.2.2

4.2.1.3 Public Opinion Survey

The sample size of the survey was unimpressive when compared to the numbers who attended the public hearings. There were only 61 respondents to the online survey. This represents less than half the number of people who attended the first public meeting, and hardly a quarter of the second. The survey was advertised online as well as through a community newsletter sent out by the community councilor and the WDC.

All the same, 0% of respondents said that the Waterfront would be an irrelevant part of the community. The survey identified that 72% of the respondents live within five kilometers of the BWD, and that 77% said that they would walk to the site in the future. Also, 91% of the respondents have been to the Bedford Waterfront, and 80% use the existing park and boardwalk on an occasional or regular basis. The results suggest that the sample was an interested and invested portion of the community's population. This was the goal of the survey. However, exactly 60 residents attended a public design workshop on April 15, 2009 – the day before the survey was administered (Ekistics 2010, p. 13). There is reason to suspect that many of the survey respondents were the same as those who attended the design workshop. The survey, therefore, yielded little diversity from the broader public. The public opinion survey scores low on the acceptance criteria.

4.2.2 Independence of Participants

Independence suggests that the level of bias involved in the visioning process is limited and regulated. Rowe & Frewer (2000) suggest that “managers and facilitators are not only independent in actuality but are seen to be independent. Likewise, public representatives should be independent of any affiliation to the sponsoring body” (p. 13). The following analysis will aim to situate the various stakeholder bodies – municipal, consultants, private investors, and the broader public – within their general predispositions in order to better understand the true nature of independence for the BWD public consultation process.
4.2.2.1 Public Hearings

The very nature of a public hearing creates a divide between the invested stakeholders present at an event. There are those who are presenting, and those who are listening. And, those who are presenting have been a large part of the planning process and those who are listening have not – they are an audience at the end of this process. Public inquiry and questioning is the only time where this divide is tempered. Even so, a public hearing clearly represents bias in its most normal form. A public hearing allows different actors to express their unique opinions: some perspectives are indeed shared (such as the perspectives of the presenters), although many are exclusive to particular individuals. The BWD public hearing events of June 10, 2009 and June 16, 2010, both reflected these qualities.

The consultants from Ekistics and Colliers International, however, often acted as facilitators at these events. Being neither members of the Bedford Community nor HRM, these consulting firms acted as the bridge between VisionHRM authorities and the public. They were able to control questioning and mitigate bias, but only to the extent to which they still had to support their work; as is only natural. For naturalistic reasoning associated with perspective – meaning that objectivity is scarce in a municipal-public planning setting - as well as for the working structure of a public hearing, the independence of participant’s scores moderately.

4.2.2.2 Citizen Advisory Committee

Guided by VisionHRM strategies, the CLG and VIC were mandated to be independent community groups that would coordinate activities and information between the planning authorities and members of the public. The BWD amendment process also required that an independent consultant would be hired to develop the eventual final plan, as well as to “host a series of workshops and public meetings during the course of preparing recommendations” (HRC 2008, p. 2). It was also proposed that, separate from the VIC, a steering committee be created with a mandate to:

- provide direction to the consultant during the course of preparing the studies;
- ensure that members of the public have opportunity to participate and express their opinion. (p. 2)
The Steering Committee is comprised of the following members:

- The Bedford Waterfront Vision Implementation Committee (4 members: 1 Chairperson and 1 representative from each VIC Task Group)
- Waterfront Development Corporation (1 member)
- United Gulf Ltd. (1 member)
- Sobeys Leased Properties Ltd. (1 member)
- Councillor for Polling District 21 as ex-officio non-voting member. (p. 6)

The data reveals a number of important findings on the subject of citizen advisory committee’s independence.

For one, the selection of a third party facilitator in order to coordinate the visioning for the development of a final report satisfies Rowe & Frewer's criterion. As a third party facilitator, Ekistics became a neutral agency fully disclosed to the inputs and opinions of all stakeholders. Furthermore, Rowe & Frewer state that “independence might be obtained and shown through the appointment of a steering committee or management team that incorporates members from diverse bodies or neutral organizations” (p. 13). The BWD steering committee is made up of half members from the VIC, and the remaining from private investors and a community councilor. Although one may argue that the interests of the private investors and property owners should not be involved in a community visioning process, one must also realize that these members of the committee are legally entitled to their land, and their input should be valued and incorporated in the visioning process. Independence and representativeness, thusly, scores high in the public consultation criteria.

4.2.2.3 Public Opinion Survey

The public opinion survey was designed and managed by Ekistics, a third party controller. This limited the level of bias in the process such that it was not designed by HRM or members of the Bedford community with vested interests and unique points of views. However, in order to justly evaluate the survey for bias and independence, one must look at how the questions were framed. In other words, did the survey questions elicit a particular response? Was the outcome of the survey expected?
Survey questions 8 to 12 are the reference questions; they seek input as to what design considerations, waterfront qualities, and waterfront priorities should be targeted in future planning stages. Although the questions generated constructive responses on public opinion, the questions are nonetheless ‘closed questions’: “closed questions are shown to sharply restrict frames of reference by focusing attention on the alternatives offered, no matter how impoverished those alternatives may be and no matter how much effort is made to offer respondents freedom to depart from them” (Schuman & Scott 1987, p. 957). This can impede the independence of respondents such that the emphasis on the questions “is always based, whether recognized or not, on important assumptions about what should be included in respondent frames of reference” (p. 957). Although the sponsoring body was independent from the vested stakeholders, the ‘closed’ design of the survey questions generated predetermined, limited public response. For this reason, the public opinion survey scores moderately for the independence criterion.

4.2.3 Early Involvement?

In order to evaluate early involvement, one must not only question when the public was first involved in the many methods of participation, but one must also question the frequency and consistency of public participation. The timeliness of public involvement is important for the sponsors if they are to retain credibility from the process (Rowe & Frewer 2000, p. 14), especially in a process that has a set goal to “convey a shared community vision for the Bedford Waterfront that will guide its evolution over the next quarter century” (Ekistics 2010, p. 5).

4.2.3.1 Public Hearings

Early involvement is not in the description of the ‘public hearing’. The objective, instead, is to present the information, process, and progress on a particular project, and then to give a small amount of time for feedback. The public hearing is a result of, and not an introduction to a process. For this reason, problems naturally arise. “The format of the public hearing itself tends to produce or exaggerate conflict. The hearing is run such that proponents typically speak first, then opponents, and finally rebuttal is allowed. Thus participants who might be neutral, or only interested in information, are often placed in a position of
choosing sides” (Lando 2003, p. 76). People feel that they have been left out of a process, and often formulate opinions prior to attending a hearing – depending on how involved they have been in other aspects of the participation process.

The BWD public hearing process was very infrequent. Only two major events were held – June 10, 2009 and June 16, 2010 – and both had the aim of presenting findings, summaries and updates. The timing of the events was reasonable, however; both events did not go for more than three hours, and they were scheduled at an appropriate time of day – 7p.m. Advertising was also consistent. Many posters were placed around town in community buildings, and electronic copies were mailed to any individuals on mailing lists (a poster from the June 16, 2010 hearing is shown in Appendix D). It is perhaps only due to the structural limitations of the public hearing that the early involvement criterion of the BWD public hearing events score low in the evaluation framework.

4.2.3.2 Citizen Advisory Committee

Effectively, VisionHRM and the VIC form the foundation for the BWD public consultation process. The entire process was predicated on the involvement of various community stakeholders from the very beginning. As has been indicated throughout this report on a number of occasions, the CLG and VIC both created the vision for the BWD as well as guided its implementation. From early 2006 until presently, a citizen advisory committee has been involved in the planning process – even meeting on a weekly basis at times. Reference to Appendix B – ‘A Timeline of BWD Public Participation Approaches’ - will highlight the consistency and frequency of VIC involvement in the public consultation process. Early involvement for the citizen advisory committee scores high in the evaluation criteria.

4.2.3.3 Public Opinion Survey

The Public Opinion Survey was made available online on April 16, 2009. It was a one-time event to gather information and feedback on the BWD for Ekistics’ planning and design purposes. Naturally, the event was designed to be infrequent. However, there were other surveys prior to this one.

For example, there was a Visual Preference Survey which had 48 participants designed to “capture the preference of workshop participants for alternative waterfront
designs” (VisionHRM, May 2007). This was prior to the scope of this research; however, it highlights the fact that other public survey methods were explored throughout the entirety of the visioning for the BWD. Nonetheless, the overall infrequency and inconsistency of public surveys results in a low score.

4.2.4 Influence of Final Policy

Although the development of the Phase 2 lands have not yet been completed, let alone initiated, this criterion can be evaluated on three levels (only two of which will be addressed in this report). First, this section will evaluate the public consultation between the inception of the Action Plan (VisionHRM 2007) and the publication of the Options Report (Ekistics 2009). The second level of evaluation will examine the public consultation from the point of the 2009 Options Report to the publication of the Final Report (2010). The third level of evaluation would result from a study that would evaluate the influence of visioning on the final product of the BWD. It should also be noted that ‘policy’, in the context of this report, refers to the details and recommendations made in the various plans prepared by Ekistics.

4.2.4.1 Public Hearings

The outcomes of the June 16, 2010 public hearing event are unknown, and form the ‘third level’ of evaluation. Therefore, this section will evaluate how effective the June 10, 2009 public hearing was in influencing the details of the Final Report.

It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of influence for public hearings. Indeed, the very nature of public hearings “seems designed to contain and control participation by allowing only limited choices on narrow, short-term questions” (Rowe & Frewer 2000. P. 18). More critical analysis of public hearings also suggest that it is not “reasonable to expect that shortly before a critical decision is to be made, the entire organizational framework and viewpoint will shift according to comments made at a hearing, no matter how relevant, reasonable, or important those comments are” (Lando 2003, p. 79). This was, in many ways, the very process engaged for the BWD public hearings. The events were designed primarily for one-way communication consisting of presentations and testimony, and leaving any remaining time for questions and comments. Still, it was identified that the
process was valued by members of the public. Before asking a question at the June 16, 2009 event, a public participant stated that he thinks it is a "great process" (HRM, June 10, 2009, p. 4). Although more informative than influential, the Q&A sessions were well received.

One example, however, does suggest that shared public opinion can influence final policy. Concern about a public road that would connect Shore Drive to Waterfront Drive (and thus the new development lands) was voiced on a number of occasions: a participant was "very concerned with the connection from Shore Drive and the waterfront and expressed that he thinks this is not a good idea" (p. 5); another participant echoed this concern stating that "Shore Drive is very narrow and a number of years ago the residents lobbied to closed the connection from the Bedford Highway to Shore Drive because of the amount of cut thru traffic in a quiet residential area" (p. 6). If we compare the Options Report proposal to the Final Draft proposal, we can see that this consideration was taken seriously.

FIGURE 4.4: ROAD ACCESS BETWEEN SHORE DRIVE AND WATERFRONT DRIVE: OPTIONS REPORT (LEFT) V. FINAL REPORT (RIGHT)

Figure 4.4 shows the transformation of a small aspect of the plan as a result of public input at a public hearing. Whereas in the Options Report (left) Shore Drive and Waterfront Drive are connected, the Final Report (right) recommends policy that would effectively restrict vehicular access between the two roads, except for emergency vehicles (Ekistics 2010, p. 82). The BWD public hearings moderately influenced policy throughout the planning stages.
4.2.4.2 Citizen Advisory Committee

Following the release of the Action Plan (2007) the VIC divided into three subgroups or task forces that targeted the main objectives of the community vision: transit, facilities & infrastructure planning, and environment. This section evaluates each of these three objectives in relation to VIC influence.

Transit:

The task force dedicated to transit and transportation set out to achieve a number of actions ranging from the creation of pedestrian (Ekistics 2010, p. 45 & 99) and vehicular (p. 67, 82 & 99) access points to the Bedford Waterfront lands, the implementation of bicycle sharing facilities (p. 73-74), enhanced trail systems (p. 62), and continued waterfront boardwalk systems - all of which were achieved in the Final Report. However, the most significant objective is described in Section T-5 of the Action Strategy (2007):

> Provide public transportation to the Bedford Waterfront and proposed ferry terminal as an integral component of a higher order service and enhance regular routes feeding these services for the wider Bedford population (p. 6).

As it stands, there is little access to the Bedford Waterfront via public transportation, and the Bedford Community believes there is a lack of connectivity to the greater HRM. In order to achieve this objective, the VIC stressed the need for supplementary goals that would

- Improve the level of public access to the waterfront both from land and sea.
- Provide viable road and water transportation links.
- Anticipate and provide for future parking needs. (VisionHRM 2007, p. 7)

The VIC helped to coordinate and implement objective T-5 and its supplementary goals by working with HRM, Ekistics, and MetroTransit – Halifax’s public transportation agency. The Transit and Transportation Task Group’s key points included: “the need for motorized and non-motorized access to the waterfront venue; the preservation of the existing rail bed as a future transportation corridor; the HarbourLink (fast ferry service) terminus initially may be predominantly used by commuters going to and returning from work on the peninsula,” (HRM, April 1, 2009, p. 1) however, the potential for Haligonians and Dartmouthians
coming by the HarbourLink to Bedford should not be overlooked. Further VIC meetings indicated that

"the transportation network should be designed to give priority to for the efficient movement of transit vehicles as this aspect will be essential for the effective operation of a ferry service. Sufficient stopping/loading/passenger assembly areas for multiple routes and frequent service should be incorporated in a potential ferry/bus transfer zone. The inclusion of rotaries is excellent but should be designed with consideration of full size and articulated buses being employed. (HRM, July 6, 2009, p. 1-2)

The Final Report meets all the aforementioned VIC considerations. Ideally the ferry terminal would host all the features that reflect what the VIC had envisioned:

- A waterfront restaurant (with cafe access to the boardwalk)
- A public library, and possibly a performance theatre
- Outdoor parking for about 60 vehicles plus bus drop for 2 buses.
- Underground parking for about 250 vehicles
- Shops and retail lease space (Ekistics 2010, p. 45)

FIGURE 4.5: FERRY TERMINAL WITH BUS TRANSFER ZONE

SOURCE: EKISTICS 2010, P. 46
Regarding the preservation of the rail bed as a potential transit corridor, it was indicated by some “that the railway option should not be included as there is no population base for a railway system” and the plan should not “lead people to believe that this can happen in the future when it cannot.” (HRM, July 6, p. 2) Conversely, the VIC concluded that while the existing rail line may or may not ever become a rail commuter route, it’s essential that HRM, in concert with the Province and the Federal Government, act with vigour within this plan or external to this plan, to preserve the railroad right of way as a continuous strip from the main Halifax rail station all the way to Truro. (p. 2)

FIGURE 4.6: PRESERVED LOCATION OF THE COMMUTER RAIL STOP & RAIL TRANSIT LINE

It was determined that a commuter rail is possible, although “it is not currently a viable alternative for HRM. The plan reserves space for a future commuter rail stop/facility across the street from the ferry terminal, should this option become more viable.” (Ekistics 2010, p. 49) Again, the Final Plan respected the input of the VIC and space for a potential rail transit line has been incorporated into the final design. Figure 4.6 demonstrates this option. Appendix E also identifies the potential alternative transit links between the Bedford-Halifax Corridor.

Community Facility:
The second VIC task force’s goal was to implement the vision that called for a central community facility that would serve as the symbolic ‘Heart of Bedford’. Section I-1 of the Action Strategy (2007) states:

Build a multi-use, indoor/outdoor community centre which could serve as a cultural and recreational hub. It could also incorporate the current Bedford Library and the proposed ferry terminal. Centre/campus could also include fountain area/children's water park which could function as an outdoor skating area in the winter. (VisionHRM(b) 2007, p. 8)

Bedford residents expressed a need for an ‘iconic’ centre. Bedford “lacks a distinct building (preferably situated by the Bedford Basin) that would attract neighbours, other metro residents and tourists.” (Lightstone 2007) A member of the VIC stated that at a youth engagement event it was recommended that something intriguing like the Sydney Opera House be built. (Lightstone) As such, the VIC worked with planners to produce what would be the makings of such a building. Figure 4.7 below shows the building as presented in the 2010 plan. Not only is this an example of how the public got what they were consulted for, but it is also an example of how the public was able to influence the location of their signature building (see figure 4.8).

In all three options in Ekistics’ 2009 report, the community facility and ferry terminal was located away from the Sobeys grocery store despite the fact that “people wanted the ferry terminal as close to the Sobeys as possible.” (HRM July 6, 2009, p. 4) Upon analysis of the community feedback pertaining to the alternatives report
it was clear that the ferry terminal and/or public iconic facility needs to be located close to the Moirs' Village and within a close walk of the bus stops on the Bedford Highway. Similarly, the facility needs to be sited close to any
potential future commuter rail options. This places the public facility as a first phase component. (Ekistics 2010, p. 44)

Although what has been presented here was just one example of infrastructure planning, overall, there was a high level of influence on the Final Report from the VIC.

Environment:
Being a common trend in contemporary planning, environmental concerns over design and sustainability, such as LEED standards, comprise a significant part of the Final Plan. Although the VIC did push for these design standards, it is likely that an environmental theme would have been taken in this study regardless of community involvement. As such the specifics of the environmental design standards will not be discussed in this report. What was a primary concern for Bedford residents and the VIC, however, was the preservation of key natural features such as Moirs Pond and the forest to the west of the Sobeys Lands. In addition, the preservation and creation of park space was a highly contested subject between the public and the planning authorities; investors and planners require land in order to balance the costs and revenues of the project, whereas the public values park land as a public commodity for leisure and recreation.

First, objective E-2 of the Action Strategy simply stated: “Protect Moirs Pond.” (HRM 2007, p. 12) It was also noted by the VIC that “the public wants to keep the forest.” (HRM July 6, 2009, p. 3) Both of these concerns were heavily considered in the Final Report. On the subject of Moirs Pond, the proposed plan “will not only create a vibrant and attractive waterfront park, but will restore the shoreline to a functional landscape.” (Ekistics 2010, p. 41) Note as well the preserved forest as indicated in Figure 4.9.

Second, the Moirs Village phase of the planning strategy also incorporates a park system that borders the Moirs Pond restoration project (see figure 4.9). It should be noted that DeWolf Park, “Phase One’s large central park space, was planned to provide the complete open space requirements for both phases (i.e., Phase Two had no further requirement for dedicated park space beyond the public boardwalk).” (Ekistics 2010, p. 9) Despite this early requirement, the 2010 plan still managed to incorporate a significant area designated to open park space.
In conclusion to the VIC's influence on the final policy, the criterion scores high. The Final Plan reflects a holistic plan that has taken into consideration many of the VIC's Task Force's suggestions and objectives. The public consultation process effectively incorporated the VIC's visions into the plan.

4.2.4.3 Public Opinion Survey

The two most highly responsive waterfront issues as indicated on the survey are open space and trail connectivity. Essentially, the public values public land. Over 97 percent of survey respondents indicated that ‘open space’ (parks and trails) is best suited for the
Bedford Waterfront; 46 percent placed ‘quality parks and open space’ as the highest waterfront priority; the most important waterfront uses include a ‘destination park’ and a trail connection, at 75 and 84 percent respectively; and, people felt that a ‘waterfront boardwalk’ and a ‘destination park’ would be the number one and two reasons to visit the waterfront regularly. (Ekistics 2010, p. 105) And, as has been indicated in the previous sections, park and trail systems were largely incorporated into the Final Report. Yet, once again, we must consider the design of the survey questions.

Because the survey is framed by closed questions, certain alternatives have been left out and the public has been given limited choice, even when there is opportunity to select an option which gives them complete autonomy (such as and ‘other-please specify’ survey option). The BWD survey demonstrates how irregular distributions can be misleading when representing public choices; “on the one hand, respondents tend to choose among the alternatives offered to them, even where they are explicitly instructed that this is not necessary.” (Schuman & Scott 1987, p. 959) However, this strategy assumes that the answers provided to a question do represent what respondents have ‘in mind.’(p. 959) In this way, the public opinion survey limited the public’s opportunity to provide ‘open’ responses to questions that could have led to meaningful change for the BWD. Instead, the public only responded to what the survey designers thought were the most pressing issues. For this reason, the public opinion survey scores low for influence on final policy.

4.2.5 Transparency of Process to the Public

Quite simply, the criterion of transparency identifies the ways in which the process of participation is made transparent to the public. This means that the broader public will be able to see how decisions are made and they will have adequate opportunity to attend meetings and access any relevant information. By being transparent, there is greater opportunity that “public suspicions about the sponsors and their motives may be allayed” (Rowe & Frewer 200, p. 15) and that the public will appreciate the process and their role in it.
### 4.2.5.1 Public Hearings

First - and this point extends to all other BWD participation methods - almost all information on the BWD has been made readily available on the HRM official website. The public can access VIC and steering committee meeting minutes, HRM and HRC proposal approvals and amendments, and Ekistics planning reports. VisionHRM has ensured a great deal of transparency throughout the entire process.

On the topic of public hearings, the two major events were open to all members of the public. Additionally, upon entrance at each public meeting, audience members received an agenda of the proceedings and were asked to sign a ‘sign-in sheet’ with name, email, and area of residence. This information was then used to send out additional information to those who attended, including who to get in contact with to make comments. Moreover, for those who were unable to attend the public hearings, alternative means of viewing the presentation were made possible. For example, the June 16, 2010 public hearing was video recorded and uploaded to the HRM website. Both public hearings have also documented and made available the meeting minutes which summarize the event, including the question and comment segment. Despite the fact that only a few large scale public hearings were held to disseminate information and gather community feedback, VisionHRM made many efforts to ensure a high level of transparency.

### 4.2.5.2 Citizen Advisory Committee

As a part of the amendment process for the BWD public participation programs, it was made clear in a Halifax Council Report that “Meetings of the Steering Committee shall be open to the public.” (HRC 2008, p.6) Any community member had opportunity to sit in on visioning sessions and observe the process, and contribute where appropriate.

HRM support staff made their contact information available and allowed for arrangements to be made if members of the public wished to present to the committee. VIC meeting information was also posted on an online forum as details were confirmed. The public had access to agendas, meeting summaries and minutes, as well as presentation materials. Moreover, information was made public only when it was deemed honest and reliable. For example, the WDC representative for the VIC had identified the following:
substantial progress has been made by the consultants in working out a financially feasible phasing for the overall implementation of the vision. The only outstanding issue with the study is obtaining the second access from the Bedford Highway. Much open-ended discussion ensued regarding the various mechanisms that could be used to acquire the second access land. WDCL does not want to put the draft of the report out until this issue is resolved so as not to raise false expectations in the minds of the public. (HRM, Jan 27, 2010, p.1)

Onsite signage was another important strategy that was incorporated to ensure public transparency. It was suggested to “have a sign indicating the overall plan for development with emphasis on phasing. It was felt communication informing the public was important.” (HRM< July 6, 2009, p. 5) Along the existing boardwalk many such signs exist and are often updated to promote on-location public information. For these reasons the BWD citizen advisory committee scores high for transparency.

FIGURE 4.10: EXAMPLE OF BOARDWALK SIGNAGE (A)
There was opportunity to access information before and after the fact; public choice, thusly, becomes the determinant in this scenario.

4.2.5.3 Public Opinion Survey

As was speculated earlier, the number of respondents involved in the online survey almost perfectly matches the number of people who participated in a focus group workshop one day earlier. Therefore, this report questions how transparent the public opinion survey was to the broader public. It seems as though only those highly invested in the process were aware of the survey for participation. The interpretation of the information is also misleading in that the survey is referred to as a ‘community engagement event’ (Ekistics 2010, p. 13): however, what part of the community was ‘engaged’? Although the results of the survey were eventually made public and are included in the Final Report (2010), the public opinion survey scores low for transparency.
4.3 Conclusion

The scoring for each evaluation criterion has been collected and recorded in Table 4.3. As can be seen from this table, the criterion for public hearings has a variant score overall, whereas the public opinion survey has scored generally low overall. What is significant and interesting is that the Citizen Advisory Committee scored a consistent ‘high’ across all acceptance criteria. The following chapter, Chapter 5, will analyze this data against public participation and neoliberal theory in order to help better understand these results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance Criteria</th>
<th>Public Hearings</th>
<th>Citizen Advisory Committee</th>
<th>Public Opinion Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness of participants</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of true participants</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early involvement?</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on final policy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of process to public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Analysis

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will relate the research findings in Chapter 4 to the theoretical foundations and precedents established in chapter three. Accordingly, the BWD will be situated on Arnstein’s *Ladder of Participation*, and the strengths and weaknesses of the public participation program will be analyzed in relation to neoliberalism’s aforementioned characteristics. Within this analysis it will also be demonstrated that, despite neoliberalism’s limiting qualities to public participation, unique opportunities for cooperative planning are still present. It will be suggested that the BWD is a good example of where a municipal-public planning partnership can foster proactive and progressive urban ideas.

5.2 Stakeholder Analysis

After reviewing the findings and referring back to Figure 2.2.1.1.2, Arnstein’s *Ladder of Participation*, one can immediately eliminate rungs one and two when assessing the quality of public participation for the BWD. These two rungs describe levels of ‘Non-Participation’, meaning that the real objective of a planning program is “not to enable people to participate...but to enable powerholders to ‘educate’ or ‘cure’ the participants.” (Arnstein 1969, p. 217) Although aspects of the public participation process were meant to be educational for the public (i.e. public hearings), the findings clearly demonstrate that the process was participatory from start to finish.

Further up the ladder are increasing levels of citizen power which apply more appropriately to the BWD. Rungs three to five are levels of ‘Tokenism’ meaning that the public is allowed more of a voice in the process. The problem within this level concerns the extent to which this ‘voice’ is heard; in other words, “there is no follow-through, no ‘muscle’, hence no assurance of changing the status quo.” (p. 217) Concerning the extent to which the public was able to influence the final policy, the findings indicate that two of the three public participation techniques – Public Hearings and Citizen Advisory Committee - scored well on the ‘Influence on Final Policy’ acceptance criteria. As such, the public did
have ‘muscle’, or strength of influence on policy outcomes, to a certain degree. For this reason, we can situate the BWD, in part, on rung five, ‘placation’: the public was put in a position in which they were allowed to advise the powerholders. In this rung the powerholders “allow citizens to advise or plan ad infinitum but retain...the right to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice.” (p. 222) As expected, citizen power is still limited at this level in that the powerholders have the “continued right to decide” on the public’s advice (p. 217).

At the top rung of the Ladder, ‘Citizen Power’, there are clear links between rung six and the BWD. Although, through expertise and technical guidance, Ekistics, Colliers, and the HRM had ultimate authority to determine and judge the legitimacy and logistical aspects of the public’s planning ideas, the VisionHRM model called for a ‘Partnership’ in decision-making responsibilities. The fundamental aspect of this rung lies in the public’s ability to negotiate. Through structures such as the VIC (an example of a joint policy board or citizen advisory committee) a municipal-public planning partnership offers a unique structure for resolving impasses and establishing ground rules for give-and-take policy mechanisms. (1969) The BWD public participation program not only fulfills the requirements of Arnstein’s sixth rung, but also the objectives set forth by the HRM in the Regional Municipal Planning Strategy:

Participation programs need to be transparent, inclusive, collaborative, and provide an opportunity for the constructive exchange of information. The programs need to provide an opportunity for participants to work together with government to generate solutions that may not have otherwise been considered. This enables municipal decisions to benefit from local knowledge and ideas, while the public can learn about new concepts and successful examples from other municipalities. Different consultation tools are available that encourage creativity and the sharing of ideas and concepts, such as visual preference surveys, design workshops, three-dimensional modeling and web-based communication. (HRM, RMPS 2006, p. 146)

Through this joint exercise, the BWD planning process has enabled a level of citizen power that is situated on and between Arnstein’s fifth and sixth rungs: ‘placation’ and ‘partnership’.
Absolute citizen control was not achieved; however, it would be remiss to assume that such a scenario would generate the absolute best results for the BWD. There are a multitude of stakeholders involved in this process, and, although this report has concerned itself primarily on the concerns of the public, the considerations of the municipality, private investors, and the planning consultants - among many other potential actors not discussed in this report - must also be maintained. The point of the exercise has been to determine the extent to which the Bedford public was heard from within these power relations; power relations where the dominant roles have exhibited a neoliberal agenda.

5.2.1 Overall Strengths of the Participation Process

The VIC, or citizen advisory committee, has satisfied all the acceptance criteria with a high score. From its origin, the VIC was effective in implementing the vision that was set forth in 2007 despite the many difficulties associated with waterfront development planning. Competing interests regarding waterfront developments require unique compromises (Grant 2008, p. 526), and the Bedford contest was no different. Through creative visioning, the BWD public participation process has created an “ideological framework within which ‘civic entrepreneurs’ – that is, community leaders who catalyze innovation – deploy their local social networks to facilitate intergovernmental collaboration.” (p. 519) The municipality and consultants were required to accept local desires to maintain and enhance the sense of community that is Bedford, while retaining development space for economic interests.

5.2.2 Overall Weaknesses of the Participation Process

The most obvious weakness of the BWD public participation process was the public opinion survey. It is argued here that the survey scored low - not because of any weakness within the visioning process - because of the structural, innate weaknesses of the survey as a viable option to gather reliable and ‘open’ public response. As was discussed in the previous chapter, the ‘closed’ format of the survey’s questioning restricted the public's ability to construct viable planning alternatives. Only the normative neoliberal planning options were presented on the survey which offered little room for public thought that
could challenge the status quo. Referring to Appendix C, one can see the closed nature of the survey questions.

Similarly, the public hearing has demonstrated some weaknesses that have within the BWD public consultation process. At most, the public hearing rendered inconsistent outcomes using the Rowe & Frewer (2000) criteria. Specifically, the design of the public hearing was set up as an informative event, which is not an effective technique for challenging the hegemonic order. Lando (2003) suggests that the public hearing is becoming more closely identified with government decision making processes, and it is being noted as an ineffective tool for influencing policy, or directional decisions of the local government. (p. 81) It is often the case that because the role of the public hearing is to publicize information in order to educate the community, this role is frustrated by the public’s desires to be heard and not to listen. As such, “those attending a hearing want to influence policy to reflect their orientation and are not of a mind-set to be convinced that they need to reorient themselves to see the perspective of the decision makers. Those council or board members establishing policy likewise are not in a position to reorient themselves.” (p. 81) The end result is that the public hearing becomes an informative event with no real effective purpose for involving the citizen in local government. Because no real “information exchange occurs and those speaking tend to be polarized by the process, the public hearing actually creates more cynicism about government rather than producing any positive results.” (p. 81)

5.3 Challenges, Limitations and Constraints to the BWD Participation Process

The BWD is a neoliberal development. Even after evaluating the public participation efforts, the results of the Final Report reflect neoliberal qualities. So what was the objective of this exercise if, regardless of public intervention, the results of a municipal-public participation process still resort to the status quo? Indeed, it is with this point that the objective has been realized.

Evidently, neoliberalism in and of itself is the most constraining aspect to urban waterfront development. There are certain norms to governance, geography and demographics that even the public reproduce in their planning demands. The thought of planning or urban living alternatives is clearly limited by the prevailing ideology of the
time: neoliberalism. However, this exercise has demonstrated that, despite the philosophical standards or ideological power structures that seemingly and statically dominate the sociopolitical urban landscape of our time, citizens do possess power and agency, and neoliberalism is not a monolithic system.

This report has emphasized “that there are many actors and movements influencing urban developments and politics, and that cities are characterized by frictions and contestations.” (Scharenberg and Bader 2009, p. 327) The main task of this critique, then, is to strengthen the agency of theory within the context of the urban landscape. One may do this by demonstrating that even places dominated by neo-liberal ideology are not ‘neo-liberal cities’, but are instead highly contested areas characterized by constant, everyday struggles. They are these ongoing struggles that “actually shape and transform the city itself, showing the way to effectively challenge neoliberal dominance. Intellectual critique should therefore continue to initiate and support societal change in the interest of the many.” (p. 334-335) Although there are planning norms that may still satisfy a neoliberal agenda, it has been shown that through the public’s challenge of contesting neoliberalism – whether realized or not – alternatives for new opportunities in urban waterfront planning are made possible.

5.3.1 Opportunities to Citizen Participation

Another city is possible!
- Scharenberg & Bader 2009, p. 335

The BWD visioning process can “contribute to a fuller understanding of the ways new and more flexible urban governance practices have been established, their relationship to planning practices and their influence on waterfront development.” (Desfor 2004, p. 480) According to Desfor, flexibility suggests that the governing bodies “involved with the regulation of change on the waterfront have bent and stretched established planning practices in quite elastic ways. It also refers to the ease with which governments and government agencies altered the then existing organizational arrangements and styles of governing.” (p. 488) The BWD case highlights the potential for new and innovative ways to engage in waterfront development and planning in neoliberal times.
The formation of the VIC and the flexibility by which it operated represents a departure from usual Halifax urban planning practices. There is a “strong legacy of clientelism and patronage politics in Nova Scotia” (Grant 2008, p. 520) which has led many to “see Halifax as wielding slim political power.” (p. 521) It is suggested that there is insufficient collaboration between the different levels of government (p. 521) and the greater public alike, which has given rise to very distinct, structured and hierarchical planning procedures. But, the VIC process was an innovative, outside formal planning, and eclectic HRM planning initiative.

If we can begin to balance an understanding of Arnstein’s *Ladder* – particularly the upper rungs that give light to the power involved with ‘citizen control’ – with a better understanding of sociopolitical theory, there is great opportunity for development to contest the mainstream and offer new and exciting planning ideas. New forms of flexible urban governance will vary depending on the context within which they develop (Desfor 2004, p. 481), but the possibility for change within the regulatory mechanisms that often pre-dictate the outcomes of development is an exciting thought.

**5.4 Conclusion**

HRM and the Bedford community have been relatively progressive in their public participation policies in planning and development. The BWD is an important example of a rounded planning approach that incorporates the views and values of the community that is most affected by a city’s planning proposal. Furthermore, and perhaps most significant, is the importance of this case study as a lens into the broader sociopolitical forces that drastically influence planning policies and decision-making mechanisms. Concluded from the findings and the analysis, it has been demonstrated that not only is public participation possible under the neoliberal agenda, but it is also a way to challenge neoliberalism’s standard conventions. And, perhaps without knowing it, the very act of public-municipal negotiation and contestation presents alternatives, thus rejecting the TINA syndrome of a neoliberal development. Imaginably, then, there is opportunity for the creation of another, different city.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

6.1 Summary

The Bedford Waterfront Development (BWD) case study presented in this report represents a critique towards the ‘monolithic city’. The urban landscape, particularly the urban waterfront, is a contested site where different forces – the political, the social, and the physical - come together to produce change. Processes like public participation highlight the power and potential for cities to develop under principles that are not predetermined, despite the clout of neoliberal dominance and normalcy. Through the effective management and realization that there are a variety of interactions, movements and ideologies that influence urban form and everyday urban life, the dynamic nature of a city is revealed.

Additionally, this report has stressed the importance of including the theory of the broader sociopolitical landscape into the analysis of urban expressions. The convergence of theory and real life implications reveals a better understanding the ways in which a city operates. There are both invisible and real forces that influence how a city changes and how a city is experienced, and these forces should not be ignored nor studied separately.

Thusly, through the combination of theoretical analysis and the review of relevant planning documents, this report has evaluated the BWD public participation efforts in order to give light to the possibility for alternative planning mechanisms under the neoliberal paradigm. As such, this report has suggested that the BWD has appropriately provided the Bedford community with a voice in the planning process despite the fact that the development is neoliberal in nature. By using an array of public participation methods – public hearings, a public opinion survey, and a community liaison group – the BWD case has contributed to a fuller understanding of the ways new and innovative collaborative planning can influence waterfront development.

Moreover, it has been demonstrated that the intrinsic features of any one participation method cannot act alone in determining whether or not that method will be effective. (Rowe & Frewer 2000, p. 25) Instead, there are a number of contextual and environmental factors that interact with the characteristics of a method to determine
effectiveness. Hence, “while one method may be appropriate in a certain situation, another method may be more apt under different circumstances.” (Rowe & Frewer p. 25) Public participation is therefore unique to location and project characteristics. The different participatory planning techniques were not entirely effective throughout the BWD planning and development process; however, as a whole, the process fostered a positive partnership between the community and the planning authorities.

6.2 Directions for Future Research

There is incredible opportunity for further research on the topic of the BWD. For one, the development itself is still ongoing and is projected to continue for over thirty years. Within this timeframe there will undoubtedly be more planning, more participation, more conflict, more change - perhaps even change on the sociopolitical landscape. There may even be advancements in participatory theory and participation techniques. Thirty years from now it will be exciting to reflect upon the different processes of transformation.

Furthermore, only three participation techniques have been evaluated in this report, and only one evaluation criteria methodology was explored. There were indeed other participation techniques employed in the BWD process, such as direct community engagement activities and focus groups, yet this report only considered three in order to provide a thorough evaluation rather than a cursory study of participatory practices. Also, Rowe & Frewer’s (2000) model was selected because it was thought to be the most applicable to the BWD case. It is likely that other evaluation criteria methodologies would yield different results and offer new opportunities to draw comparisons.

Finally, insofar as this case study looked at the broadest sociopolitical structure that is neoliberalism, it would be interesting to evaluate the BWD from within the unique political, economic and social indicators of the Halifax region. It would be worthwhile to more deeply investigate the specific connections between the local urban condition and the forces of global change; for urban change, that is, requires an analysis worthy of the upmost scrutiny as it has the potential to reveal both the most simple and complex understandings for all human interaction.
References


Appendix A

Timeline of major events preceding the June 2010, Bedford Waterfront Development Final Report:

- **1983** – Establishment of the Bedford Waterfront Development Corporation (BWDC) to manage Bedford’s shoreline development lands
- **1985** – Conception of the *Bedford Waterfront Development Plan*
- **1987** – Phase I construction initiated (final construction is still ongoing)
- **1996** – Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) amalgamation
- **2001** – Waterfront Development Corporation Ltd. (WDC) takeover of the BWD project
- **2006** – HRM *Regional Municipal Planning Strategy* adopted
- **2007** – **February**: VisionHRM initiated, HRM’s community visioning strategy  
  **February to July**: Bedford Waterfront Community Liaison Group (CLG) formed to consult on a community vision and action plan for HRM Council approval  
  **October**: *Community Vision and Strategic Action Plan* adopted by Council
- **2008** – **January**: Vision Implementation Committee (VIC) formed to guide the implementation of the *Community Vision*  
  **October**: Ekistics Planning and Design contracted to head the BWD design study and public consultation initiatives
- **2009** – **June**: Three development options presented to the public; publication of the *Bedford Waterfront Plan Options Report*
- **2010** – **June**: Preferred option presented to the public; publication of the *Bedford Waterfront Design Study: Final Report*
Appendix B


- Public Hearings
- Citizen Advisory Committee Meetings
- Public Opinion Survey

- February 28, 2008
- March 26, 2008
- April 16, 2008
- May 28, 2008
- June 11, 2008 – Community Facilities and Infrastructure Task Group Meeting
- June 12, 2008 – Transit and Transportation Task Group Meeting
- June 16, 2008 – Development and Design Task Group Meeting
- June 25, 2008
- July 23, 2008
- September 17, 2008
- October 29, 2008
- November 26, 2008
- January 28, 2009
- February 25, 2009
- March 25, 2009
- April 1, 2009
- April 16, 2009 – Public Opinion Survey
- May 13, 2009
- June 10, 2009 – Public Hearing and Presentation for the *Options Report*
- October 28, 2009
- December 9, 2009
- January 27, 2010
- February 24, 2010
- June 16, 2010 – Public Hearing and Presentation of the *Final Report*
Appendix C

Survey questions and results from the Bedford Waterfront Development public consultation process. The following is sourced from Ekistics 2010 *Final Report*, pages 104-105.
4. Approximately how many kilometers do you WORK from Bedford Waterfront Urban Design Study Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1 km</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 km</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 km</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 km</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10 km</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>15%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(skipped this question)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Can you view the Bedford Waterfront Phase 2 study area from your house or work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Have you ever visited Phase 1 of the Bedford Waterfront?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>15%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(skipped this question)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Have you used the Park or Boardwalk in Phase 1?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>15%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(skipped this question)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. What kinds of uses are best suited for the waterfront?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Highly Suited</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Low Suitability</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Condominiums, Apartments, Town Homes)</td>
<td>45.24% (19)</td>
<td>35.71% (15)</td>
<td>19.05% (8)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (parks, trails)</td>
<td>97.67% (43)</td>
<td>2.33% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (office, retail restaurant)</td>
<td>47.5% (19)</td>
<td>35% (14)</td>
<td>17.5% (7)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (Government, churches, schools, etc.)</td>
<td>7.14% (3)</td>
<td>33.33% (14)</td>
<td>59.52% (25)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Warehousing, wholesale, distribution)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>4.76% (2)</td>
<td>95.24% (40)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Use (marina, ferry terminal, marine uses)</td>
<td>69.77% (30)</td>
<td>25.58% (11)</td>
<td>4.65% (2)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Please Specify in Question 14</td>
<td>29.41% (5)</td>
<td>70.59% (12)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents (skipped this question) 43
9. Prioritize the issues you feel need attention on the waterfront.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>1st (highest priority)</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th (lowest priority)</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Accessible Waterfront</td>
<td>58.14% (25)</td>
<td>20.93% (9)</td>
<td>13.95% (6)</td>
<td>4.65% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>2.33% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Design</td>
<td>31.82% (14)</td>
<td>34.09% (15)</td>
<td>20.45% (9)</td>
<td>6.82% (3)</td>
<td>2.27% (1)</td>
<td>4.55% (2)</td>
<td>0% (U)</td>
<td>0% (U)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Green Design</td>
<td>36.36% (16)</td>
<td>15.91% (7)</td>
<td>13.64% (6)</td>
<td>11.36% (5)</td>
<td>9.09% (4)</td>
<td>2.27% (1)</td>
<td>6.82% (3)</td>
<td>4.55% (2)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>46.51% (20)</td>
<td>18.6% (8)</td>
<td>11.63% (5)</td>
<td>11.63% (5)</td>
<td>11.63% (5)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retail Destinations</td>
<td>9.52% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>14.29% (6)</td>
<td>21.43% (9)</td>
<td>9.52% (4)</td>
<td>19.05% (8)</td>
<td>7.14% (3)</td>
<td>19.05% (8)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height and placement of Buildings</td>
<td>25.56% (11)</td>
<td>6.98% (3)</td>
<td>13.95% (6)</td>
<td>13.95% (6)</td>
<td>11.63% (5)</td>
<td>9.3% (4)</td>
<td>11.63% (5)</td>
<td>6.98% (3)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>20.93% (9)</td>
<td>11.63% (5)</td>
<td>6.98% (3)</td>
<td>2.33% (1)</td>
<td>13.95% (6)</td>
<td>6.98% (3)</td>
<td>20.93% (9)</td>
<td>16.28% (7)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Related Uses</td>
<td>25% (10)</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td>20% (8)</td>
<td>10% (4)</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td>15% (6)</td>
<td>7.5% (3)</td>
<td>17.5% (7)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Please specify in Question 14.</td>
<td>7.14% (1)</td>
<td>14.29% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>7.14% (1)</td>
<td>7.14% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>14.29% (2)</td>
<td>50% (7)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 44

10. Check all the 'important' public uses you think are necessary to make the waterfront work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Use</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford Public Library</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Centre</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Ferry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market or Boutique Shopping</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Park</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Connection</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 44

(skipped this question) 17
11. How would you get to the waterfront in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What would bring you to the waterfront regularly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Boardwalk</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Waterfront Restaurant</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Destination Park</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Marina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Public Building</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutique Shopping</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performances</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How important could the Bedford Waterfront be as part of the overall community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Example of a public hearing memo for the Bedford Waterfront Development:

Source: http://www.halifax.ca/visionhrm/bedfordwaterfront/Events.html
Appendix E

Proposed alternative transportation option routing between Bedford and Halifax: