

**Reaching the Unreachable:
Social Planning in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside
& Winnipeg's North End, Canada**

by
Vanessa Scarola

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
The University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

Department of City Planning
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

Copyright © 2016 by Vanessa Scarola

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgments.....	vi
List of Tables.....	vii
List of Acronyms.....	viii
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Topic Overview & Background	1
1.2 Indigenous Population Growth in Canada	3
1.3 Research Purpose & Scope	5
1.3.1 Statement of Purpose	5
1.3.2 Key Research Questions	5
1.3.3 Relevance of Research	6
1.3.4 Scope & Limitations	7
1.3.5 Outline of Chapters	7
2.0 Literature Review.....	9
2.1 Social Planning Practice	9
2.2 Critiques of Social Planning	10
2.3 History of Social Planning in Canada	12
2.4 Summary	13
3.0 Theoretical Framework.....	15
3.1 Social Justice	15
3.2 Social Sustainability	18
3.3 Principles of Effective Social Planning & Summary	19
4.0 Research Methods & Analysis.....	21
4.1 Comparative Case Study	21
4.1.1 Justification of Research Sites	22

4.2	Data Collection	23
4.2.1	Semi-Structured Interviews	23
4.2.2	Policy / Program Review	24
4.3	Data Analysis	25
5.0	Systemic support and relationship based: Different approaches that promote social justice and social sustainability through planning.....	28
5.1	Social Planning in the North End	29
5.2	Social Planning in the Downtown Eastside	43
5.3	Comparative analysis: How model integration could more effectively endorse the principles of social sustainability and social justice	64
5.4	Summary	74
6.0	Conclusions & Recommendations.....	75
6.1	Summary of Findings	75
6.2	Lessons from Winnipeg & Vancouver	81
6.3	Implications for Planning Practice	83
6.4	Potential for Future Research	84
6.5	Conclusion	85
7.0	References.....	87
	Appendices.....	93
A	Ethics Approval Letter	94
B	Project Backgrounder	95
C	Consent Form	96
D	Interview Questions	100

Abstract

Social planning has remained a longstanding element of urban planning practice and continues to be pursued through different institutional structures in Canada. While the City of Winnipeg currently features no municipal social planning department, the City of Vancouver attempts to support its most disadvantaged neighbourhoods through its municipal sector. As these are two cities with high concentrations of Indigenous populations, this research uncovers the degree to which these two social planning models have worked to support the particular needs and interests of residents living in Winnipeg's North End and Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. Through the comparative case study of these two research sites, comprehensive document analysis and semi-structured interviews with key informants from planning agencies in each city, it is evident both models promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes within their respective neighbourhoods. However, neither is without fault. As a government body Vancouver is able to create and track progress in a more systemic way, setting targets and metrics for other government agencies, while information sharing and relationship building are where non-profit organizations in Winnipeg truly excel. This research explains how most non-profit organizations are unable to successfully sustain themselves, while municipal departments lack the rapport grassroots organizations more easily attain. Therefore, an integration of both models could begin to better support Canada's most disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations.

Key Words: social planning, social justice, social sustainability, Downtown Eastside, North End, government, grassroots, non-profit, Indigenous, advocacy, Canada

Dedication

This research is dedicated to the past, present and future residents of Winnipeg's North End and Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. May it initiate, lead and continue the conversations to which you have so thoughtfully and eloquently contributed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Janice Barry, for your enduring guidance, leadership, and expertise. I could not have done this without your continued support and visioning. I would also like to thank my committee members for contributing to the evolution of this project. Dr. Rae Bridgman, I will always admire your wisdom and love of planning. Dr. Wanda Wuttunee, you were the missing piece to this puzzle. Thank you for your time.

To my participants: this could not have happened without you. Thank you for sharing your stories, your insight, and your experiences. You have made such a difference in this world and I am honored to have spoken with each and every one of you.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their continued support and encouragement throughout my life. I know I would not be where I am today without you and I appreciate that every day.

Thank you.

List of Tables

Table 5.1.1	NECRC's Roles & Functions.....	31
Table 5.1.2	Engagement and Relationship Building Approaches.....	36
Table 5.2.1	Guiding Principles and Assumptions.....	44
Table 5.2.2	DTES Local Area Plan Principles.....	45

List of Acronyms

SPCW	Social Planning Council of Winnipeg
NECRC	North End Community Renewal Corporation
NA!	Neighbourhoods Alive! Program
DTES	Downtown Eastside
SIA	DTES Social Impact Assessment
LAP	DTES Local Area Plan
LAPP	DTES Local Area Planning Process

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Topic Overview & Background

Social planning strives to strengthen neighbourhoods through research, advocacy and planning, with the potential of offering progressive community development to impoverished areas. Although concerns have been raised about the so-called ‘dark side’ of social planning and its historical connection to top-down exercises in social engineering, social planning is a common area of practice in the Canadian context. Operating both within and outside municipal government, social planning organizations and departments offer the potential to support systemically marginalized groups living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

This study examines social planning practice in two of Canada’s most disadvantaged neighbourhoods: Winnipeg’s North End and Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside (DTES). In Winnipeg, the North End is bound by the Red River to the east, McPhillips Street to the west, Carruthers and Matheson Avenue to the north, and is separated from south Winnipeg by a number of CPR Railway tracks (Buckland & Martin, 2005). Social planning for Winnipeg’s North End is facilitated through a number of non-profit agencies. Concentrated within Winnipeg’s inner city, the North End has endured marginalization and socio-economic exclusion dating back to the 1800s. At present, the socio-economic disparities of the past have become more exaggerated; poverty and crime rates in these 18 neighbourhoods continue to be the highest in Canada (Islam et. al, 2012). While a clear need for more adequate support has endured throughout the decades, municipal, provincial and federal governments remain largely absent in the North End. At the time of this writing, policies attempting to support the North End include the *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan (2011-2016)* and *Neighbourhoods Alive!*.

Unlike the City of Winnipeg, which features no municipal social planning department, the City of Vancouver attempts to support the Downtown Eastside through its municipal sector. Commonly referred to as Vancouver's "skid row", this area has long struggled "with the pressures of socio-polarization" (Smith, 2003, p. 496). The Downtown Eastside is made up of the Chinatown, Gastown, Victory Square, Strathcona, and Oppenheimer neighbourhoods, and includes a park and industrial area ("Jurock - Vancouver Downtown Eastside, BC area information", 2014, para. 1). The area is bound by Main Street to the west, Clark Drive to the east, Burrard Inlet to the north, and Hastings Street to the south (Newnham, 2005). Like Winnipeg's North End, the Downtown Eastside is immediately adjacent to railway lines and has experienced periods of rapid decline since the 1930s. During this same period, the neighbourhood has experienced rising rates of violent crimes, increased drug and alcohol dependence, an HIV/AIDS epidemic, and an influx of Indigenous¹ Canadians (Smith, 2003). According to the City of Vancouver's Downtown Eastside Local Area Profile (2012), Indigenous groups comprise only 2% of the total Vancouver population, while disproportionately accounting for 10% of the total population of the Downtown Eastside (p. 9). In recent decades collaborative and integrative approaches to policy interventions, and coordinated initiatives among municipal departments, community agencies and the private sector have prompted change in the Downtown Eastside (Smith, 2003). At the time of this writing, policies attempting to support the Downtown Eastside include the *Healthy City Strategy*, *Social Impact Assessment*, and the *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan*.

¹ The term *Indigenous* will be used to refer to all First Nations people throughout this paper. However, when quoting from policy or statistics, the term *Aboriginal* will be used, as most federal, provincial and municipal documents use this type of terminology.

This research aims to generate a better understanding of how these two social planning models have worked to support the particular needs and interests of current residents living in these neighbourhoods. Their attributes are further analyzed using core concepts found in the literature regarding social justice and social sustainability through the comparison of the strengths and weaknesses of both social planning models. Specifically, this research answers the question: how and to what degree have these two different models of social planning worked to promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes in these disadvantaged neighbourhoods? Given the high proportion of Indigenous people living in these areas, greater attention has been given to understand how lessons could be applied to better support this growing demographic (see Section 1.2). Through the comparative case study of these two research sites, comprehensive document analysis and semi-structured interviews with key informants from planning agencies in each city, lessons from both social planning models are presented.

1.2 Indigenous Population Growth in Canada

Comparatively speaking, the Indigenous population in Canada is growing and becoming increasingly urban. According to Statistics Canada, since 1996 the number of Aboriginal Canadians has nearly doubled, from 2.8%, to 4.3% of the total Canadian population (2011, p. 4). With Vancouver a close second, Winnipeg has the largest Aboriginal population among all census metropolitan areas (Statistics Canada, 2011). In Winnipeg, the North End has the highest concentration of Indigenous residents, with Aboriginal groups comprising 30.8% of the total North End population, while only accounting for 10.2% of the total population in Winnipeg (Malabar & Grant, 2010, p. 3). According to Statistics Canada, Winnipeg's Aboriginal

population experienced unprecedented population growth of 22% between 2001 and 2006 (2010, p. 6). This growth has been attributed to “higher fertility rates and shorter life expectancy” than other Canadian populations (Statistics Canada, 2011, p. 15). Additionally, this rapid growth can be seen across Canadian cities, as Aboriginal populations are growing much faster than non-Aboriginal groups (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, n.d.).

While Indigenous groups experience many of the same medical issues as the general population, they continue to be over-represented in many “health problems, including AIDS/HIV, diabetes, osteoporosis, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS), substance abuse, alcohol addiction, and suicide” (Xu et. al, 2001). According to Xu et. al (2001, p. 26, 27):

- Nearly 20% of Indigenous births indicate some level of FAS;
- Indigenous youth are between five and eight times more likely to commit suicide;
- The average life expectancy of Indigenous children is eight years lower than the national average;
- While Indigenous children make up only 10% of the population of children in Canada, they comprise 30% of children’s hospital beds in Manitoba;
- 10% of the Indigenous population is infected with HIV/AIDS;
- The HIV/AIDS infection rate is remarkably higher for Indigenous youth, young adults, and women, indicating a high level of prostitution within the Indigenous community; and
- Indigenous groups in Canada have three times the national average for diabetes.

In Winnipeg, youth gangs and prostitution continue to be critical issues for the Indigenous community (Xu et. al, 2001). Indigenous youth are six times more likely to be incarcerated and currently make up 69% of youth in correctional custody (Xu et. al, 2001). Furthermore, “approximately 50% of all street prostitutes in Manitoba are Aboriginal” (Xu et. al, 2001, p. 28). Some attribute these exaggerated statistics to “systemic discrimination” or Indigenous misconceptions of justice and law (Xu et. al, 2001, p. 28). Whichever the case, Canadian

statistics currently indicate a need for more adequate support for Canada's growing urban Indigenous populations.

1.3 Research Purpose & Scope

1.3.1 Statement of Purpose

While there are different models for addressing social issues related to social planning within and outside of public and private structures in Canada, the existence of chronically disadvantaged neighbourhoods like Winnipeg's North End and Vancouver's Downtown Eastside demonstrate the importance of a need for the coordination of services and more adequate funding for social planning. Through the critical investigation and assessment of both social planning models in Winnipeg's North End and Vancouver's Downtown Eastside, this project identifies opportunities and challenges of each model, while filling research gaps identified in the existing literature and ultimately providing a set of recommendations for how to more adequately support disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Canada with growing urban Indigenous populations.

1.3.2 Key Research Questions

To better understand how and to what degree these two models of social planning have worked to promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes in these disadvantaged neighbourhoods, this research attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How have these two social planning models worked to support the particular needs and interests of residents living in Winnipeg's North End and Vancouver's Downtown Eastside?
 - a. What achievements and successes have occurred?

- b. What challenges or barriers have been faced?
2. How and to what degree have these two different models of social planning worked to promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes in these disadvantaged neighbourhoods?
3. How could these lessons be applied to better support the growing number of Indigenous residents living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods?

1.3.3 Relevance of Research

This research explores the value of social planning departments in the public and non-profit sectors to better understand what is required to support disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations, like Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg's North End. By identifying and working to promote greater understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of both the non-profit and municipal social planning models, this in-depth, comparative case study offers insight into the specific needs, conditions, and requirements of social planning within the two research sites. Lessons from both models provide a framework for how to more adequately support disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations. Therefore, the proposed project is significant because it identifies a major gap in the existing literature regarding social planning and how it may be applied to better support disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations.

This research provides a context for how social planning could be used as a tool to foster social justice and social sustainability in Canadian cities generally. Lessons from both social planning models have many implications for municipal and non-profit planning practice. By

demonstrating the importance of social planning as a catalyst for social change, this project identifies social planning characteristics that could be present across Canadian cities.

1.3.4 Scope & Limitations

The scope of research poses some limitations. This research acknowledges it has only explored the range of social planning practice within the City of Vancouver and Winnipeg, and thus acknowledges potential limitations of a relatively small data set. However, as discussed in greater detail in the Methods Chapter (Chapter 4.0), the seven interview participants were all leaders in their field, with many years of social planning experience in their respective cities. Furthermore, this research acknowledges it has only used social justice and social sustainability as core concepts to research and analyze the data. Nevertheless, this research demonstrates how these two constructs offer considerable insight into the potential of social planning practice in Canada.

1.3.5 Outline of Chapters

This thesis begins with a brief literature review of social planning that defines and characterizes the historical context of the discipline, and indicates how it has shaped the North American planning context (see Chapter 2.0). Next, the theoretical framework upon which this research is based is explained, outlining principles of effective social planning based on the literature on socially just and socially sustainable practices (see Chapter 3.0). Then, this thesis describes the research methods and analysis used to conduct this project, summarizing the comparative case study method, justifying why Winnipeg and the City of Vancouver have been chosen as research sites, summarizing the methods of data collection for semi-structured

interviews and document analysis, and clarifying the coding methods used for interviews and policy review (see Chapter 4.0). Following this, results from Vancouver and Winnipeg are shared, showcasing the outcomes of systemic support and being founded in relationships (see Chapter 5.0). Finally, conclusions and recommendations for planning practice are outlined in the final chapter (see Chapter 6.0). Appendices are also attached.

2.0 Literature Review

Operating at the municipal and community levels, social planning has long been disputed in urban planning practice. Often regarded as “planning from the bottom,” social planning encompasses many disciplines and social goals, including education, health, and social integration (Archibugi, 1996, p. 83). Many argue that social planning is as vital as all other aspects of physical planning and should, therefore, be designed in conjunction with the other areas of urban planning practice. Although recognition of the need for social planning remains clear, implementation of public programming by the public sector is often overlooked. The following chapter gives an overview of social planning as a discipline and outlines its many critiques. Then, a brief history of social planning in Canada is summarized, with gaps in the existing literature becoming apparent.

2.1 Social Planning Practice

Wood (1964) argues physical planning alone cannot produce desired gains without “appropriate and adequate social welfare programs” (p. 119). Thus, social planning “should be a function of the agency responsible for physical planning,” and strategies for both should be developed together (Wood, 1964, p. 119). Planning decisions regarding social welfare, as Thompson (1980) points out, are important because they “identify the necessary conditions for instituting public policy” (p. 207). Thus, social planning can be a catalyst for social change and community development. Dubey (1979) identifies five steps in the process of social planning. First, a problem, such as alcoholism, juvenile delinquency and prostitution, must be identified and analyzed. Social problems can be further divided into four major categories: simple, compound, complex, and meta (Dubey, 1979). Meta problems, such as poverty, are “least

precise” because of the number of variables causing the problem and the extent to which each contributes to it (Dubey, 1979, p. 4). Next, short- and long-term social planning goals should be outlined. Availability of resources and other factors are considered during this stage. The third step in this process is the identification and analysis of alternatives, as well as assessment of their outcomes. During this stage, means to reach goals are identified, outlined and assessed based on their cost to society (e.g. public attitude, legal complications, etc.). The selection of an alternative represents the fourth step in social planning process (Dubey, 1979). This stage often chooses a “workable” solution rather than the “best solution” so that compromise among conflicting groups is equitably met (Dubey, 1979, p. 5). The fifth and final stage features the development of a specific program or service (Dubey, 1979).

Debate surrounds the steps involved in social planning process. Westhues (1980) argues three distinct sets of tasks should be differentiated within the programming stage. In this view, program design, program implementation and program operation must be “recognized as delimiting separate stages in the social planning model” (Westhues, 1980, p. 331). By recognizing each set of tasks as separate, there is a greater chance the tasks will be carried out effectively, as it would be easier to assess the point at which the planning process failed. Likewise, there lacks consensus on when exactly the programming stage begins and when it ends (Westhues, 1980).

2.2 Critiques of Social Planning

It is clear social planning involves a complex and detailed process that attempts to provide alternatives to negative contemporary societal trends. Many scholars argue against adopting social planning practices within current city plans, as social planning has been criticized

since the 1960s. Characterized by ill-defined terms, the practice of social planning has historically “arouse[d] the deepest and most subjective of beliefs and values” (Morris, 1969, p. 366). Kahn (1969) describes social planning as “man’s [sic] effort to intervene in the functioning of a complex society” (Morris, 1969, p. 366). Thus, social planning is difficult to delineate and administer. It is also considered unreliable because it is often “affected by larger forces seemingly unconnected with the immediate program” (Morris, 1969, p. 366). Also, an apparent lack of measure for effectiveness leaves concepts such as social cost and social value misleading and individualistic (Morris, 1969).

Historically, social planning has often intended to alter class relations through strategies of assimilation and integration. In these cases, social planning has attempted to integrate “lower classes” into “more favoured localities” (Eisenschitz, 2008, p. 133). Eisenschitz (2008) maintains there is little evidence to support the argument that planning has ever explicitly been a vehicle for social reform because it is increasingly dependent upon political and social organizations. Therefore, social planning “cannot be substituted for, [or] identified with, political decision-making” (Morgan, 1974, p. 13). Mushkat (1985) attributes this lack of support to how social planners have worked almost exclusively with the “demand-side” of social planning, and not the “supply-side” (p. 22). Typically, social planners have been successful in the creation of adequate social service models, however these models have lacked insight into how they would come to fruition or be supported monetarily. Likewise, social planners have been unsuccessful in determining the exact capacity needed to support these models, making “the demand-side bias of social planning” obvious and clear (Mushkat, 1985, p. 22). Although social planning has good intentions it has been relatively reactive to social problems, making implementation much more difficult to accomplish. As Mushkat (1985) explains, “service capacity is subject to behavioural

influences over which social planners have limited control” (p. 33). In other words, social service models are often more reliant on who they are for, rather than what they truly intend to accomplish.

In Canada, social planning has developed over time and varies between provinces. To better understand current positions on social planning in Winnipeg’s North End and Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside, the history of social planning in Canada must be thoroughly examined.

2.3 History of Social Planning in Canada

In 1919, the Town Planning Institute of Canada was founded. Following the British model, the Institute included engineers, landscape architects, surveyors and architects whose major preoccupations were zoning, town design, and traffic (Wolfe, 2004). The crash of the stock market in 1929 was detrimental to Canadian society and many Canadians found themselves unemployed during this time (Wolfe, 2004). Nearly “no new housing was built, infrastructure was neglected and urban conditions” became deplorable (Wolfe, 2004, p. 5). By the mid-thirties, citizens’ groups and social welfare agencies began examining poor living conditions, overcrowding, low incomes and substandard housing in an effort to better understand them and alleviate “the ills of the cities” (Wolfe, 2004, p. 6). After this, social planning began to emerge from social work and an urgent need “to co-ordinate services, set standards, and improve working relationships” among human service agencies (Davies & Turner, 2005, p. 372).

From the onset, social planning was primarily concerned with information sharing and methods to combat social problems. During this time, social workers “played key roles in senior government circles,” which allowed them the capacity to form social planning councils “at grassroots levels” (Davies & Turner, 2005 p. 372). These grassroots councils used their senior

positions to acquire necessities and they remained able to assist citizens on more personal and individual bases. Social planning councils proved different from governments during this time because their intentions were never overshadowed by political will or other commanding influences. The enactment of the *Canada Assistance Plan* (1966) in the 1960s allowed these social planning councils to access much higher levels of resources than available previously. Unfortunately, the plans, proposals and models that were developed remained unexecuted from lack of ongoing funding (Davies & Turner, 2005).

By the 1960s, planners had a sense of social commitment and heightened awareness of social justice concerns (Thomas, 2006). Perhaps this can be attributed to the civil rights movement or the state of “urban crisis” happening in many North American cities (Thomas, 2006, p. 315). Whatever the reason, planners were motivated by the need to alleviate “racism, poverty, spatial segregation, and discrimination” and they sought to create equal opportunity through the development and improvement of existing neighbourhoods (Thomas, 2006, p. 315). Given the similarities between Canada and the US, comparable changes were also happening in Canada. This heightened awareness and changing of motivations amongst planners during the 1960s, 70s and 80s led to the formation of many municipal social planning departments across the country, including the formation of the City of Vancouver’s Social Planning Department during the 1980s.

2.4 Summary

Social planning remains a complex and contested process, proving to exhibit both progressive and regressive attributes. Although seen as a catalyst for social change, social planning typically lacks support from municipal, provincial, and federal governments.

Individualistic subjectivity hinders the credibility of social planning and causes disagreement among many organizations involved in implementation. Idealistically, social planning proposes many strategies to improve quality of life for Canadians. However, an outline of means for *how* to realistically accomplish these goals often remains undefined. A historic need to coordinate services brought social planning to the forefront of urban planning practice. Unfortunately, social planning in Canada has lost momentum and non-profit organizations have nearly taken on all social planning responsibility across the country. At this time of writing, Winnipeg demonstrates a clear need for more adequate government support through progressive forms of social planning. As there are most likely lessons from both social planning models in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg's North End, this comparative case study will uncover *what* from *each* model could more adequately support disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations.

3.0 Theoretical Framework

Clearer theoretical and conceptual tools allow for the differentiation between progressive and regressive attributes of social planning. In this chapter, two methods of evaluation are examined to better understand the requirements necessary for sufficient social planning. Specifically, social justice and social sustainability are explored to develop a theoretical framework to evaluate social planning in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg's North End.

3.1 Social Justice

Harvey (1973) defines social justice as the "application of just principles to conflicts which arise out of the necessity for social cooperation in seeking individual advancement" (p. 97). In other words, social justice can be conceptualized as the application of principles that ultimately promote individual advancement through social cooperation. Social justice concerns are exaggerated when the division of benefits and allocation of resources are imbalanced through "social and institutional arrangements associated with the activity of production and distribution" (Harvey, 1973, p. 97). According to Harvey (1973), distribution of income should satisfy the needs of the entire population and resources should always be equitably dispersed.

Issues of equity, distribution and fairness are recurring themes in planning literature. Machiavelli (1978) points out how distribution of welfare among citizens is a political problem raised through inadequate allocation of urban resources. Social justice can be thought of addressing prevailing inequalities between citizens, whereby participation in society determines "way of life" (Machiavelli, 1978, p. 375). To contest this, maximum individual freedom must be compatible with the freedom of others and inequalities must be arranged "so that they are to the

greatest benefit of the least advantaged” (Machiavelli, 1978, p. 375). Machiavelli (1978) also considers this maximization of minimum welfare “equivalent to infinite aversion to inequality” (p. 375). Therefore, the least advantaged must be offered the same opportunity, independence and freedom as the most advantaged in society. Progressive and neutral social acts increase equality the same as regressive, biased social acts increase inequality (Machiavelli, 1978). Thus, governments must support urban policies that increase equality and equitable distribution of resources in order to promote social justice in the city.

Planners must be careful not to make planning decisions that have the ability to reinforce social inequality, such as exclusionary zoning and “racially divided metropolitan populations” (Thomas, 2006, p. 315). According to Fisher and Marantz (2015), exclusionary zoning has long been attributed to land use regulation in the US by deploying regulations such as minimum lot size requirements so “municipal governments can protect their tax base” (p. 1071). In turn, this has been “associated with uncompensated negative externalities, including longer commute times, increased air pollution, concentrated poverty, and racial segregation” (Fisher & Marantz, 2015, p. 1071). Planning, as a historically spatial discipline, emerged as a way to make space “practicable, predictable, and controllable” (Winkler, 2012, p. 169). Social consciousness and dedication to principles of social justice have brought issues of inequity in transportation, land use, gentrification and the environment to light (Thomas, 2006). According to Winkler (2012), planners must “recognize, question, reassess and ultimately challenge the entrenched liberal norms of planning” to promote more equitable outcomes in competitive cities through social justice strategies (p. 167).

According to Cardoso & Breda-Vázquez (2007), planning needs to focus on patterns of distribution, relational social structures and institutional contexts in order to contribute to more

socially just urban societies. This approach advocates social justice by centering on redistributive justice, community empowerment, and self-determination (Cardoso & Breda-Vázquez, 2007).

As such, planning must encompass “a more participatory democracy grounded in the recognition of difference and therefore of formal group representation” (Cardoso & Breda-Vázquez, 2007, p. 389). Therefore, political processes must encourage social justice concerns through equitable group participation and greater coordination of planning processes.

Fainstein (2010) agrees with the notion that competitively oriented policies have exacerbated the disadvantages suffered by low-income, minority residents. Therefore, a model of ‘a socially just city’ would be “a city in which public investment and regulation would produce equitable outcomes rather than support those already well off” (Fainstein, 2010). Cyclical and recurring injustice from neoliberalism favours the rich and hinders democratic processes in the present day (Fainstein, 2010). According to Fainstein (2010), equity, democracy and diversity represent three primary qualities of urban justice and must be maximized “in a set of norms by which to direct and evaluate policy” (Fainstein, 2010). Furthermore, if groups are unable to participate in decision-making processes, inclusive consultation and representation by advocates must occur (Fainstein, 2010). Policies that foster equitable distribution of government resources produce a diverse and accessible public realm, and “make local decision making more transparent and open to the viewpoints of currently excluded groups” (Fainstein, 2010). The processes of social planning must encompass each of these requirements in order to promote social justice in the city, as this could also assist in more adequately supporting disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations, like Winnipeg’s North End and Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside.

3.2 Social Sustainability

As a wide-ranging, dynamic and multi-dimensional concept, social sustainability can be conceptualized as any development that satisfies present-day needs and does not compromise the needs of future generations (Vallance et. al, 2011). Thus, socially sustainable communities “meet the diverse needs of existing and future residents, are sensitive to their environment, and contribute to a high quality of life” (Dempsey et. al, 2011, p. 290). According to Dempsey and her colleagues (2011), socially sustainable communities “are inclusive, well planned [...] and offer equality of opportunity and good services for all” (Dempsey et. al, 2011, p. 290).

Social equity has its foundations in social justice but is clearly reflected within the definitions of socially sustainable development. Poor living arrangements and reduced access to public services creates neighbourhoods that are socially excluded, and therefore less socially sustainable (Dempsey et. al, 2011). In this way, social sustainability “is not only politically desirable, but is positively correlated with health, happiness and good quality of life” (Dempsey et. al, 2011, p. 292). Although there is currently no consensus on the ideal distance for essential services to urban populations, there is general agreement on what services and facilities should be accessible. These include access to: a doctor, supermarket, restaurant, library, recreation facility, community centre, and public green space (Dempsey et. al, 2011).

As concepts regarding well-being and livability are recently being incorporated more into policy making, the physical environment is not the only factor that must be considered in contemporary planning (Dempsey et. al, 2011). In order for a community to remain sustainable, the community must be able to “sustain and reproduce itself at an acceptable level of functioning” (Dempsey et. al, 2011, p. 293). Socially sustainable communities “encompass social networks, norms of reciprocity and features of social organization, and the integration of

resulting social behaviour” (Dempsey et. al, 2011, p. 293). In other words, social sustainability can be measured by the ability of a community to produce healthy, functioning and thriving citizens who identify with each other through a sense of community. In this sense, urban Indigenous communities are unique because much of their culture, identity and sense of community have been taken away due to consequences arising from residential schools, institutional racism, and poverty.

3.3 Principles of Effective Social Planning & Summary

Based on the reading of the literature, social planning will be evaluated through the following concepts. First, social justice is conceived as promoting social cooperation and equitable allocation and distribution of resources (Harvey, 1973; Machiavelli, 1978; Cardoso & Breda-Vázquez, 2007). Also, political processes that advocate principles of redistribution, community development, and group participation evidence socially just social planning practice (Cardoso & Breda-Vázquez, 2007). In addition, democratic policy and processes that produce equitable outcomes and adequate representation are socially just (Fainstein, 2010). Lastly, social justice actively works to prevent exclusionary zoning, socio-spatial control, and competitively oriented policy (Thomas, 2006, Winkler, 2012, Fainstein, 2010).

Likewise, social sustainability promotes security for future generations, inclusivity, and equality (Vallance, 2011; Dempsey et. al, 2011). Also, increased access to public services, social networks, and having a sense of community signify progressive attributes of social planning (Dempsey et. al, 2011). In this same sense, socially unsustainable social planning practice feature communities who are unable to meet the needs of current and future generations, have reduced

access to public services, are socially excluded, and have no integrated social networks

(Vallance, 2011, Dempsey et. al, 2011).

4.0 Research Methods & Analysis

The next section outlines the comparative case study method and explains why Winnipeg and the City of Vancouver were chosen as important research sites. Then, methods of data collection are summarized for semi-structured interviews and policy documents chosen for the document analysis. Finally, the inductive, deductive, and triangulation coding methods for the in-depth data analysis of the interviews and policy documents are explained.

4.1 Comparative Case Study

Through the comparative case study analysis of the two research sites, the ultimate goal of this research is to offer lessons for how to more adequately support disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations. Yin (2014) articulates the importance of the case study method as a desire “to understand a real-world case and assume that such an understanding is likely to involve important contextual conditions pertinent to [the] case” (p. 16). Case study analysis of the City of Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg’s North End will offer insight into the specific needs, conditions, and requirements of social planning within these two research sites. By identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each social planning model (or unit of analysis), “cross-case” conclusions may be applied to the urban Indigenous populations of Winnipeg’s North End and Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside (Yin, 2014, p. 18).

For the proposed research design, the research questions informed all research propositions studied within the City of Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg’s North End. Specific theories, such as principles of effective social planning, social sustainability and social justice were applied to the results to accurately analyze and interpret the data. Multiple

sources of evidence allow for triangulation and “the development of converging lines of inquiry” and research findings “are more convincing based on several different sources of information, following a similar convergence” (Yin, 2014, p. 120). Thus, the research findings are supported by more than one source of information. In addition, Winnipeg and Vancouver are fairly representative samples of social planning councils and municipal social planning departments across Canada, each representing an example of the public and non-profit sectors in Canada and strengthening the external validity and reliability of this research. Reliability is evidenced through the minimization of errors and bias so the study could be replicated by anyone, at any time (Yin, 2014). Specifically, having a consistent data collection protocol and interview schedule minimizes errors and bias. These tactics were utilized throughout the entire research design so the quality of research does not come into question and the ultimate goal of the research is undoubtedly fulfilled.

4.1.1 Justification of Research Sites

The overall approach to this research involves is a qualitative, comparative case study of the two social planning models in Winnipeg’s North End and Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside. Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg’s North End were chosen as research sites because they are representative of complex Canadian social planning cases. Winnipeg has the largest Aboriginal population among all census metropolitan areas in Canada, with 25,970 or 3.6% of the total population in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2011). Also, Winnipeg’s Indigenous population is younger and increasing faster than the average Canadian population (United Way, 2010, p. 9). Many additional barriers face this group throughout their lifespan, “including lower educational levels, greater incidence of single parent families, poor health, poor living

conditions, social instability and barriers of institutional racism” (United Way, 2010, p. 22). It is also important to note that nearly half (48.1%) of all children aged 14 and under in foster care are Aboriginal, compared to only 0.3% of non-Aboriginal children. Therefore, it is imperative that additional methods of support for this group are explored. The City of Vancouver employs a municipal social planning department and perhaps disadvantaged neighbourhoods like Winnipeg’s North End could benefit from such a sector. Undoubtedly both models could benefit from each other, as Winnipeg could benefit from a more publicly-funded model and Vancouver could benefit from a more independent, non-profit model. Thus, two methods of data collection have been chosen to identify and understand what is required from each model to more adequately support cities with growing urban Indigenous populations.

4.2 Data Collection

Two qualitative research methods have been employed to gather research data for this project. This comparative, qualitative research design included seven semi-structured interviews with key informants related to this research, and the comprehensive document analysis of relevant policies for the City of Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg’s North End.

4.2.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

Based on the social planning literature and theoretical framework regarding social justice and social sustainability, interview questions were created for a total of seven semi-structured interviews with key informants (three from Winnipeg; four from Vancouver). Interviews were conducted over the phone, with approximately six interview questions (two questions had sub-questions) and took an average of 35 minutes to complete. Key research questions were used as a

guide throughout the formation of interview questions, so the ultimate goal of research was upheld with each question. Participant responses from each interview were recorded and later transcribed using ExpressScribe. For the complete list of Interview Questions see **Appendix D**.

From Winnipeg, key informants were a previous Executive Director of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, a Community Animator from the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, and the Community Development Director from the North End Community Renewal Corporation. From Vancouver, key informants were a previous Aboriginal Social Planner for the City of Vancouver, someone immediately under the City Manager from the Social Policy Department of the City of Vancouver, a previous planner from the old Vancouver Planning Department, and a Senior Planner for the Downtown Eastside Neighbourhood Planning Group. My understanding of the organizational structures for social planning within Winnipeg and Vancouver is based on my interpretation of how interviewees described their agencies and positions within them. It is important to note there were potential research participants that could not be reached and were therefore unable to participate in this research project. These individuals may have greatly contributed to this research and, therefore, this leaves opportunity for future research on this topic.

4.2.2 Policy / Program Review

Each interview contributed to a greater understanding of the policy document(s) are significant to each research site. Based on how many instances these documents were referenced, the most recurring documents were chosen for research and analysis. From Winnipeg, policy documents chosen for analysis include the *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan 2011-2016* (2010) and *Neighbourhoods Alive!* (2011). These two policy documents inform much

of the planning and development activities taking place within the North End of Winnipeg. From Vancouver, policy documents chosen for analysis are the *Healthy City Strategy* (2014), the *Downtown Eastside Social Impact Assessment* (2014), and the *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan* (2014). These policy documents specifically affect planning and development in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and it is important to note the *Healthy City Strategy* (2014) is a municipal planning document affecting the entire city. In Chapter 5.0, a description of the organizational structures within social planning agencies in Winnipeg and Vancouver are described, followed by brief overviews of the appropriate policies / programs affecting each neighbourhood and subsequent document analysis. The next section explains how these policies, programs and documents were analyzed.

4.3 Data Analysis

Based on the literature, a series of factors were also considered to understand the degree to which these social planning models promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes. As outlined by Auerbach & Silverstein (2003), coding "is a procedure for organizing the text of the transcripts, and discovering patterns within that organizational structure" (p. 31). For the purposes of this research, deductive codes were drawn from the literature regarding social justice and social sustainability. Specifically, social justice can be conceived as promoting equitable allocation of resources, political processes that advocate redistribution, political processes that advocate community development, and political processes that advocate group participation. Social sustainability can be conceived as promoting security for future generations, inclusivity, equality, increased access to public services, social networks, and having a sense of community. Conversely, social justice will be considered to also actively

prevent exclusionary zoning, socio-spatial control, and competitively oriented policy. Finally, social sustainability will be considered to also actively prevent the inability to meet the needs of current generations, inability to meet the needs of future generations, reduced access to public services, social exclusion, and lack of integrated social networks. As these first deductive codes were based on the conceptual framework, inductive codes were then developed to capture points that were new / different from the original codes through the data that was gathered during participant interviews. For example, social cooperation was a deductive code signifying social justice and empowerment of residents was an inductive code generated through the gathering of data. Additionally, inclusivity was a deductive code signifying social sustainability and recognition was an inductive code also generated through data gathering.

To easily organize participant responses based on inductive and deductive codes, four spreadsheets were created. For each research site, two spreadsheets were generated from the theoretical frameworks of social justice and social sustainability. Thus, quotes from each transcription were organized and easily identifiable for data analysis and triangulation with corresponding and appropriate policy documents. Since qualitative research is often disputed for its level of trustworthiness, lack of reliability, and because it is predominantly interview-based, triangulation was implemented to demonstrate and enhance the validity and reliability of this research (Decrop, 1999; Bauwens, 2010). Triangulation allows information coming from different angles to be used to “corroborate, elaborate or illuminate the research problem” (Decrop, 1999, p. 158). In this way, sources of triangulation with different strengths are able to complement each other and enhance the validity of research findings to confirm qualitative findings by showing independent sources that converge on the same result (Bauwens, 2010; Decrop, 1999). For the purposes of this thesis, data triangulation was used in accordance with

gathered primary data (semi-structured interviews) and secondary data (policy documents) to ensure credibility (internal validity), transferability (external validity), dependability (reliability), and confirmability (objectivity). Patterns were discovered, theories were developed and, in order to maintain validity, all interpretations of the data are supported through triangulation with policy documents. This thematic analysis is further explained in Chapter 5.0.

5.0 Systemic support and relationship based: Different approaches that promote social justice and social sustainability through planning

The findings of this research project are explained in this chapter. Beginning with the history of social planning in the North End of Winnipeg, this chapter recognizes the work of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg and the North End Community Renewal Corporation. Each organization is grounded in the formation and maintenance of personal relationships, an approach that has fostered their enduring success. As Winnipeg does not have a municipally funded social planning department, the Neighbourhoods Alive! program is also explained, as this is the closest entity to a publicly-funded model that Winnipeg has. The policies upon which these organizations are based are then analyzed for their levels of socially just and socially sustainable practices. The chapter looks closely at the North End's five-year plan and how non-profit organizations have worked to promote social justice and social sustainability through more grassroots approaches to public engagement. Ultimately, the chapter reveals how non-profit organizations endorse a level of social equity that is more difficult to maintain in the public sector because civil servants can feel pressured to represent all groups and are less able to work directly with specific communities. Next, the social planning practices of the City of Vancouver are described, including the history of the department and policies that have shaped the city in recent years. These policies are also analyzed based on their promotion of socially just and socially sustainable practices. The City of Vancouver's unique approach of having an Aboriginal Social Planner and formally recognizing Indigenous history through the declaration of a 'Year of Reconciliation' with Indigenous groups are also explained. Finally, the similarities and differences between the two models are analyzed, ultimately indicating how an integration of both would be the most ideal situation for disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Canada with

growing urban Indigenous populations. The italic text throughout this section is meant to draw attention to the social justice and social sustainability principles present within these two cities.

5.1 Social Planning in the North End

The Social Planning Council of Winnipeg (SPCW) is a 95-year-old, non-profit organization funded mostly by United Way, but also in part by the City of Winnipeg and Province of Manitoba. According to a former SPCW Executive Director, the organization's Mission Statement remains simple: the SPCW is "oriented to helping create that kind of a community that is caring, just, and equitable" (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). The essence of the SPCW's core values lie in those three terms and in the belief the resources of society are earned collectively and should, therefore, be shared collectively. The SPCW strives to enable and empower community organizations to achieve explicit goals through the improvement of ongoing capacity and responsiveness within their community. As an organization, the SPCW is based on a strategic plan outlining specific areas of focus that include increasing incomes and access to affordable housing, community development, and equity in social programming (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). While Winnipeg does not follow a publicly-funded social planning model, nor have a municipal social planning department within its jurisdiction, there are two specific policies / programs that attempt to effect change within North End neighbourhoods. The Province of Manitoba's Neighbourhoods Alive! (NA!) program attempts to respond to the declining social, economic, and physical conditions in Manitoba by providing core funding to neighbourhood renewal corporations such as the North End Community Renewal Corporation (NECRC) (Institute of Urban Studies, 2005). In support

of initiatives outlined within their five-year neighbourhood plans, the funding assists “in the management and coordination of community-based renewal” (Peralta, 2007, p.2).

Since the 1990s, NECRC has developed into a thriving community organization, integrating countless enterprises and resident groups within the North End (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015). The mandate of NECRC “is to promote the social, economic, and cultural renewal of the North End” (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 7). According to NECRC’s Community Development Director, NECRC brings the community together through mutual respect and inclusiveness, to coordinate a range of activities around housing, safety, employment, and business development (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015). This Director attributes NECRC’s success to being considered neutral and open to working with anyone, “as long as process and fairness is involved” (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015). Funded through NA!, the work of NECRC is based on the *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan (2011-2016)* (2011). The plan explains how many believe the North End “does not receive its equitable share of municipal services”, “the general state of affairs needs a collective upgrading”, and Aboriginal populations make up the single largest group in the area (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 6). The plan strives to promote social, economic and cultural renewal through community-led initiatives, distinct resident participation, and elaborating on agreed-upon goal statements. These goal statements detail specific initiatives, strategies, and strategic partnerships for eliciting the desired results and expectations of North End community members (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011). Created collaboratively with residents, the roles and functions of NECRC stated within the 5-year plan are listed in Table 5.1.1.

Table 5.1.1: NECRC's Roles & Functions (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 9)

To act as a facilitator of ideas and opportunities, between groups, organizations, and governments to achieve common goals.
To serve as an organizer and coordinator: of meetings between groups of supports for residents associations, of actions on issues beyond neighbourhoods, of community-wide planning, and of events and consultations.
To emphasize communication and the sharing of accurate and timely information, with NECRC acting as the main distributor and holder of information.

Through the identification of these shared and agreed-upon roles and functions, the likelihood of NECRC providing adequate support for North End communities has increased in recent years (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015).

Promoting Social Justice and Social Sustainability through Lasting Relationships and Strategic Partnerships

Within North End neighbourhoods, the social planning practices of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg (SPCW) and the North End Community Renewal Corporation (NECRC) can be characterized as being relationship-based and community-driven, where the creation of strategic partnerships directs and influences planning practice. By getting to know community members on a more personal basis, non-profit organizations like these are able to ensure the inclusion and opinion of numerous community members. The SPCW's Community Animator gave an example of how they achieve such inclusion (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

We went to community clean ups, we went to the St. John's Picnic in the Park. So once we had their contact information we would call them and say, 'Hey remember the survey you did at this event? Now we're having a workshop and we're actually going to present the plan back and get feedback on this day and this location'.

Community members may have remained unreachable if these procedures had not been implemented. As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *equality* and *inclusivity* are indications of *social sustainability* and are evident throughout these participatory processes.

NECRC prides itself on being holistic and considering the North End as a whole, making sure to include youth, religious groups and other community members in each of their decisions. According to the Community Development Director for NECRC, “it takes time to build trust and it's all about relationships and we just happen to have a good ED [Executive Director] that looks at that, and he knows that that is the most important thing” (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015). *Group participation* such as this brings community members together through common interests and achievable goals. For example, the Community Animator for the SPCW summarized encouraging renters and homeowners to be increasingly inclusive, as they recognized the need to not only work with these groups but with all residents of the William Whyte neighbourhood in the North End (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

And there was a renter there that said ‘We need more rental properties, I can't afford my place to live, and the landlords are not taking very good care of our properties’. And at the same table there was a homeowner that starting talking about how renters were the problem and that they're not contributing to the community, and as they discussed they learned that they both had a lot in common. That they both cared about their community and there perceptions were challenged by each other, and by the end they were saying ‘Yeah, we need rental properties in this community and we also need homeownership opportunities for those that are able to purchase homes’. But for many of our residents that will never be a possibility, so we need healthy, safe places for everyone in our neighbourhood.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *security for future generations* is a sign of *social sustainability* and is evident through the creation of unlikely, lasting relationships with different community groups within the North End. Other examples of *equality* and *security for future generations* are clear through the inclusion of translators for ethnic groups, such as

Burmese and Congolese peoples. Inventive engagement strategies to elicit participation have also included this example (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

At one point the community threw an annual BBQ. It was during the summer so what we did is that we knew that there would be anywhere from 3- to 400 people coming to that BBQ. What [our employee] did is [they] designed a questionnaire and [they] turned it into a BINGO card so that when people came we asked them to fill in the questionnaire. Now if it had been just a dry survey it would have been really hard to get people to participate. But when people saw these people banging away with their BINGO markers with these forms, they came to us and out of that 300 people that came there we had 60 people that participated. Now that's a very high return and it was a simple survey but it was really a good way of getting average citizens to participate who had never otherwise come to meetings or certainly would never fill in an online survey or something like that. It's just an example of when you really put in the essential contribution of the people themselves at the forefront, there's different ways you can do that, both specific as well as more general in terms of the structure of things.

A typical project with the SPCW sees partnerships with other organizations, where they are hired on as consultants responsible for background research, the management of focus groups, and plan development. The SPCW also manages community data programs, neighbourhood level statistics, and neighbourhood profiles. They attribute much of the success of their most notable projects to the countless meaningful relationships made through their work with residents associations, steering committees, and community members. Many of these relationships originated through the inclusion of incentives (such as door prizes, food, and childcare) for participatory planning processes and subsequent follow-up procedures, encouraging community members to be known on a more personal basis (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015).

Both the SPCW and NECRC use capacity-building techniques to support and inspire residents throughout the North End. These techniques allow residents and officials to remain empowered for their actions within their community. According to the previous Executive Director of the SPCW (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

Everything we do is also oriented to enabling and empowering community organizations, in the sense that we very rarely ever do something *for* an organization. We always work

with an organization because just to do something for someone actually doesn't empower them. It may address the immediate issue but it doesn't lay the foundation for ongoing capacity and responsiveness in a community.

The SPCW has also made sure to include Indigenous residents in leading the community toward development and capacity-building initiatives (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

In the William Whyte Housing Plan we made sure that some of the community researchers hired, were Indigenous themselves [...] The goal was to bring Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents together, as opposed to isolating different groups, so [...] more than half of those that were surveyed and came out to the meetings were Indigenous.

These examples of *community development* and *social cooperation* are signs of *social justice* and clearly present through the capacity-building techniques of the SPCW. Additionally, instances of community development are seen through the ability of residents' associations to identify and implement community development approaches and by-law enforcement. As described by a Community Animator for the SPCW (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

The residents' associations developed a list of the top 10 worst houses that they want dealt with, so there's houses that were burnt down years ago that were just sitting vacant and kids played in them and they were just in terrible shape. Rather than calling 311 all the time they developed a strategy. So they have a list of the top 10, they report them regularly but they also report on them at their residents associations meetings so it's a way of keeping residents involved and celebrating their successes every time they can knock one of those houses off their top 10 list and move down they have been able to achieve something.

The SPCW is not the only non-profit organizations that attempt to effect change within North End neighbourhoods. According to the Province of Manitoba (2010), NA! has proven successful as a "community-based neighbourhood revitalization strategy for neighbourhoods and communities" throughout the province, including Winnipeg, Flin Flon, and The Pas (p. 1). NA! is considered as a "long-term commitment to rebuilding neighbourhoods in need" through "comprehensive, innovative and significant provincial investment" in community-led organizations "for local planning, enhancement projects, economic development and community

support programs” (Government of Manitoba, 2000). In total, six neighbourhoods within Winnipeg have been recipients of NA! grant funding and three of these neighbourhoods (Point Douglas, Lord Selkirk, and William Whyte) are located within the North End (Government of Manitoba, 2010). This community-based, social and economic development strategy aims revitalization efforts at housing improvements, employment training, education, recreation, and crime prevention (Government of Manitoba, 2010). These relationship-building techniques create strategic partnerships within the community, making community projects more likely to succeed over time. The program maintains, “the best ideas for neighbourhood renewal come from the community”, and comprehensive neighbourhood revitalization plans must “build local capacity, foster community learning, and establish and sustain community partnerships” (Government of Manitoba, 2010, p. 3; Peralta, 2007, p. 1, 2).

Through NA! funding, NECRC’s *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan (2011-2016)* (2011) was created with the voices and wisdom of North End residents, to “capture and realistically describe the changes and priorities expected within the community, by those that live and work within it” (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. i). Using a Community Economic Development (CED) approach, NECRC inspires residents to “create economic opportunities and enhance social conditions in their communities on a sustainable and inclusive basis, particularly with those who are most disadvantaged” (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 7). The CED approach is unique because it attempts to identify different ways of achieving growth and development through aspects of economic, physical, social, and spiritual change (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011). Thus, CED techniques require the efforts of a range of individuals and groups in many different ways so outcomes “reflect the realities and aspirations of the broader community” (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 7). NECRC

used the CED approach to gather information, elicit engagement, and consult with community members for the purposes of their five-year plan. This specific process was designed to allow the broader community to be “involved in supporting and engaging in future development” (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 7). Discussion circles and focus groups were held to identify community desires with indicators to illustrate how changes would be most evident. Engagement sessions were organized around the seven sectors NECRC uses to organize their Board of Directors, with two groups added and one ultimately removed (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011). For NECRC, it was important for each of these groups to not view themselves in isolation but instead “as part of a larger community” (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 10). The engagement and relationship building approaches of NECRC, as outlined in the 5-year plan, have been summarized in Table 5.1.2.

Table 5.1.2: Engagement and Relationship Building Approaches
(Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 9)

Tap into existing social networks
Bring organizations together more often using their membership
Increasing presence in local newspapers etc.
Using social networks to share information
Hold more discussion sessions and events with residents

As described above, NECRC’s main focuses for engagement and relationship building approaches clearly indicate a desire to tap into existing social networks, to enhance partnerships and create a recognizable presence within North End neighbourhoods. NECRC’s Community Development Director summarized community meetings like this (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015):

We will work with them and host a meeting in their neighbourhood and ask people to come out and ask that sort of question: What's the possibilities that you guys want to see over the next five years? And hear what each community, each neighbourhood is saying. Last year we did it by sector, we had a youth gathering, the seniors gathered.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *inclusivity, equality, increased access to public services, social networks, and having a sense of community* are signs of *social sustainability* and are clearly evident throughout the NECRC's engagement processes.

The extensive consultation and engagement process for the 5-year plan began in June 2010, with round table discussions at NECRC's Annual General Meeting (AGM). NECRC's Community Development Director believes the AGM has significantly grown and improved social conditions within the community in recent years by stating (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015):

It's funny because the funder comes to our AGM's, and this one particular person had been away for a couple of years, and he came back and made a remark. He said 'you know when we started coming out to the AGM's they were like 25 to 30 people, when I walked in here today and I saw these 150 people come in. I was just blown away. I just couldn't believe how it had changed over the years'. They want to be there.

Attendance for discussion circles and focus groups were significantly greater for NECRC than predicted, with the level of participation attributed to the direct contact used to invite participants, such as initial email invitations, followed by subsequent email or written mail reminders (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011). Finally, personal phone calls were given to ensure voices that did not normally attend open community forums were given equal opportunity to attend (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011). These examples of *equality* and *inclusivity* are indicators of social sustainability and are evident throughout NECRC's numerous approaches to elicit participation from community members.

The final phase of engagement for the *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan (2011-2016)* (2011) involved the use of a community survey as a tool "for ongoing group information gathering" (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 12). Staff and Board members administered the survey during regularly scheduled events, such as resident association meetings,

housing group meetings, and food security steering committee meetings. Surveys were reviewed and adjusted to enhance applicability, including wording and formatting revisions considered more appropriate for youth (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011). Questions were not intended to be evaluative but instead sought to have community members provide insight “into what types of initiatives and actions they considered to be most important” to stimulate change over five years (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 12). Also, the structure of the questions attempted to “ensure higher degrees of validity” and minimize personal interpretations of anyone administering the survey (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 12). Information gathered from the surveys supported feedback received throughout the sectoral discussions and provided a greater level of detail for initiatives within each of NECRC’s primary areas of focus, including safety, economic development, employment, housing, recreation and wellness, culture and diversity, and overall community development. After priority community outcomes and indicators were presented to community members during round table discussions and final adjustments, a final version of the goals were developed for the final report (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011).

The SPCW and NECRC have also used techniques to ensure Indigenous groups were never excluded from social planning practices within the community. The Community Animator for the SPCW summarizes these practices like this (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

We looked at the community demographics and we looked at who had come out to groups and we said ‘ok, are we missing anyone?’. And we found that Indigenous people were coming out to those events, so we were meeting that target. We also went specifically to Indigenous community organizations to hold focus groups, so we had one at Aboriginal Visioning for the North End. We had a focus group with them and made sure that they were involved in all of the planning meetings that went out. And we had a focus group at Ma Mawi, so we definitely made sure that that was integrated into the planning.

Other examples of Indigenous *equality* and *inclusion* are seen within the William Whyte Housing Plan, where the SPCW ensured some of the community researchers hired were Indigenous. The goal was to bring Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents together, as opposed to isolating different groups (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). This created *social networks* for the community and allowed community members to build lasting relationships with each other. Instances of *community development* such as this are also clear when the SPCW hired Immigrant Settlement Workers to be participatory researchers (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). These individuals “already had relationships with newcomers in the community so they were the ones that organized the focus groups” (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *social networks* are an indication of *social sustainability* and are clear throughout the SPCW’s participatory planning processes in the North End.

Both the SPCW and NECRC argue the success of their programming remains difficult to measure, as the positive consequences of community initiatives most likely create snowball effects. The previous Executive Director for the SPCW summarizes a dramatic example like this (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

In 2008, a group of people came together and said that they felt there was a real problem with what was called 'summer learning loss': when children in primary school would leave at the end of June term and they would have these 2 or 3 months of gap before they went to school. There was a measurable learning loss so we helped set up something called the CSI Program. We started with a few schools, I think we had about 30 or 40 kids in the summer program, then it expanded by 2010 or so and that we had 10 or 12 schools involved, about 200 kids and then we handed over the whole program to the Boys and Girls Club to manage. Now this is 2014, last summer, they had 14 schools and over 1500 kids involved in this program. Now we haven't gone back to measure what happens to those kids, but I can guarantee not only are those kids not losing that learning through the summers, but so many of them are now getting ready to go to University, now some of those children are part of a University of Manitoba Program where they can actually get experience on the Campus at U of M. These are kids that may have never thought

about going to University from the inner-city North End, but now, not only have they come through these great learning experiences where they really enjoy and have fun learning, but it gives them a foundation on which they can then reach for University of technical training or some more. So, some day we have to go back and measure and see where those young people are after 5, 6 years but I predict a lot of them are successful in terms of employment, contributing to their community. These were kids that in some ways a lot of people would have said were low-achievers, lacked motivation, and were dealing with huge barriers in their neighbourhoods and in their homes. So that's kind of an example of where we've struggled with having an impact and how we measure or frankly how we don't measure the outcomes.

Other examples of successful projects / initiatives within North End neighbourhoods include The Live City Project, activities around Merchant's Corner (including Meet Me at The Bell Tower), and partnerships with North End United, Food Matters Manitoba, Mount Carmel Clinic, and Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre Inc. (Ma Mawi). The Live City Project is focused on the promotion of community safety through social development, as a means to bring community members, agencies, police, and the City together towards crime prevention (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). Additionally, NECRC and other community organizations meet quarterly to discuss what each is doing and how they might share resources, information or collaborate on events and activities. These types of coordination and facilitation roles are common for NECRC (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). For example, Mount Carmel Clinic elicits the help of NECRC to discuss clinic services and what their health care needs are, essentially helping define where Mount Carmel would like to go in the future and how they intend to provide support to residents (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). There have also been a number of workshops, focus groups, and surveys in the community organized by residents associations. An example of this was when Aboriginal Visioning at Ma Mawi enlisted the help of the SPCW to go out into the community and speak directly with residents (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). These instances used creative activities, such as the use of skits to "educate people about the fact that the housing plan was happening, [to] [ask] 'what kind

of housing do you want in your community?’” (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). In terms of food security, the North End Food Security Project “is pulling people together, it’s making things happen in the North End” and partnerships with Food Matters Manitoba complement these efforts (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). According to the Community Development Director for NECRC (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015):

We have a young lady that works onsite in the North End [...] who works in food security and she's focusing more on the traditional foods, and more of a retail aspect, in terms of trying to get restaurants to look at food in a healthier way, but also getting them to buy in more, in terms of what they might be serving and how they might be serving it in store.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *increased access to public services* and *having a sense of community* are signs of *social sustainability* and are clearly present in the many projects and initiatives occurring within North End neighbourhoods through the SPCW and NECRC. Furthermore, *redistribution*, *social cooperation*, and *group participation* are signs of *social justice* and are also clearly present in the many projects and initiatives currently happening in North End neighbourhoods through the SPCW and NECRC.

Looking to the future, the previous Executive Director of the SPCW stated (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

I think in a very nebulous way we’ve started a process that is going to be very significant for the city. I would hope that people that are here, ten years from here say, ‘you know in 2013 when [...] and [...] published their report [...] that really opened up an opportunity for significant social development in the neighbourhood’.

According to the Community Development Director of NECRC, next steps for the North End look like this (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015):

We take a look at all our players, sectors [...], and we organize. Actually this year the Board is talking about doing something a little differently [...] we have something called the Possibilities Team that I think the Board wants to look forward to say what's possible over the next five years and they want to hear from the neighbourhood. We're going to be [...] going out to all 9 or 11 neighbourhoods.

These examples of *social cooperation*, *equitable allocation of resources* and *group participation* are indicators of *social justice* and are clearly present within the social planning activities of the SPCW and NECRC in the North End.

In conclusion, non-profit organizations in the North End of Winnipeg promote social justice and social sustainability through the creation and maintenance of lasting relationships and strategic partnerships (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). The SPCW has specific focuses on poverty reduction and social inclusion, and heads a range of activities around municipal policy, housing and homelessness, by-law enforcement, crime prevention, policy research, capacity building, and community organization and development. The SPCW builds upon the abilities of residents to mitigate current social issues, and their work often involves encouraging local governments to engage in more formal responses to social issues currently affecting Winnipeg's most vulnerable populations (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). Likewise, NECRC strives to promote the social, economic and cultural renewal of North End neighbourhoods through community-led initiatives. Founded in building trusting relationships with community members, NECRC utilizes existing social networks to enhance partnerships and create a recognizable presence within North End neighbourhoods (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015). Both non-profit organizations attribute their success to the lasting presence they have within communities and their ability to know residents on a more personal basis. While both the SPCW and NECRC have clearly enhanced capacity within North End neighbourhoods, both could perhaps benefit from the support and funding of municipal government.

5.2 Social Planning in the Downtown Eastside

Historically, the Vancouver Planning Department has been responsible for zoning, coordinating public process, economic revitalization, policy planning, crime reduction, arts and culture, land use planning, heritage revitalization, and public realm improvement (Personal Communication, March 6, 2015). Within the organization, a stand-alone social planning department differentiates from social planning practice in Winnipeg. As one of the first departments of its kind in Canada, it has existed for more than three decades but has not gone without major structural changes since its inception. According to the current Managing Director of the department, the department's broad set of responsibilities saw structural changes when Gordon Campbell became Mayor of Vancouver in 1986, and also when he later became Liberal Premier of the Province. During this time, the department turned into what was called Community Services and became not only responsible for social planning, but also general planning and development across the city. Gordon Campbell's terms in office stimulated the growth of Community Services while depleting social planning at the City, and only recently did social planning experience resurgence in Vancouver (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). Currently, this department works cross-departmentally, with roles and responsibilities including "the identification of key social issues in the city, putting forward priorities for Council consideration, as well as Council direction to respond on matters of social nature" (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015).

A Healthy City for All: Vancouver's Healthy City Strategy (2014) is a municipal plan intending to address Vancouver's three interconnected challenges of "climate change, an increasing prevalence of chronic health conditions, and growing inequality" (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 4). The plan informs and underlays social planning in Vancouver and is grounded in the

World Health Organizations four requirements for change related to urban health: political commitment, shared visions, organizational structures that facilitate change, and partnerships with statutory and non-statutory groups (City of Vancouver, 2014). The City of Vancouver believes these conditions are currently present within the city, making this “the right time for the Healthy City Strategy” (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 7). This social strategy represents the third of a three-pillared long-term sustainability plan, which includes *The Greenest City Action Plan* (2012) and *The Vancouver Economic Action Strategy* (2011). Once completed the City of Vancouver hopes to be a global leader for integrated decision-making, with increased health of Vancouver’s children, families, and vulnerable populations (City of Vancouver, 2014). The guiding principles and assumption of the Strategy are explained in Table 5.2.1.

Table 5.2.1: Guiding Principles and Assumptions (City of Vancouver, 2014)

<i>A broad and holistic understanding of health and well-being:</i>	Building blocks are the interconnected social determinants of health.
<i>Fulfillment of fundamental rights and freedoms:</i>	Guaranteed under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, within the context of municipal jurisdiction and Vancouver’s desires are supported and protected.
<i>Health and well-being for all:</i>	A ‘for all’ lens is used to ensure that initiatives are universal for all citizens but focused on specific vulnerable populations with health inequities.
<i>Prevention and upstream oriented:</i>	Priority to prevention of poor health, not crisis prevention.
<i>Health and well-being is everyone’s business:</i>	Must involve the broader public, private and civil sectors, all residents, and those most affected.
<i>Healthy ecological environments:</i>	Everyone has the right to a healthy environment and awareness of anything that may cause them harm.
<i>A need for social innovation:</i>	Will take new, innovative ways of thinking to make progress on complex issues.
<i>Enabling collective impact:</i>	Efforts must be integrated across City departments.
<i>Focus on investment and action based on evidence:</i>	Investment and priority will go to those grounded in evidence to move towards targets.
<i>Monitor, evaluate and communicate:</i>	Must track metrics to assess progress. Evaluate and communicate results.
<i>Lead and model:</i>	City will show leadership in health and well-being.

Thus, the guiding principles and assumptions of the City of Vancouver's Healthy City Strategy indicate a desire for equality, a need to recognize the interconnectedness of initiatives and departments, and showcase the importance of health.

In response to *A Healthy City for All: Vancouver's Healthy City Strategy* (2014), the City's municipal social planning department (known today as Social Policy) examined the potential social impacts of development in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside in the *Downtown Eastside Social Impact Assessment: Draft Report – Spring 2014* (SIA) (2014) (City of Vancouver, 2014). Then, in accordance with Council and the SIA, the City and the Local Area Planning Process (LAPP) Committee created the *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan* (2014) (LAP). The main purpose of the LAP was to create a tangible framework of programs, policies and plans as means to achieve a desired future for DTES residents. The LAP also strived "to achieve a thoughtful balance which supports the continued development of a mixed-income community in the DTES without displacing Vancouver's poorest citizens" (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 23). The foundation of the LAP is based on 7 principles, which are outlined in Table 5.2.2.

Table 5.2.2: DTES Local Area Plan Principles (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 8-10)

Principle 1 – Neighbourhood Development	• Planning in the DTES strives to ensure: ○ The diverse, mixed income neighbourhoods maintain their distinct character and roles; ○ The area remains mixed-use, allowing residential, commercial, industrial, civic, and institutional uses, as well as parks and open space; ○ Building height (including historic height) and scale remain generally low to mid-rise, with new development informed by the unique heritage character; ○ Ongoing community involvement in planning of the area is supported; ○ Housing and amenities are prioritized in new development; and ○ Growth is directed to suitable locations to enhance the overall area. • These principles support the city-wide principle of achieving a green, environmentally sustainable urban pattern
--	---

Principle 2 – Housing	• Planning in the DTES strives to ensure: ○ Access to affordable housing choices in the DTES and across the city is available for low-income people, including the homeless and the working poor, children, families and seniors; ○ A housing mix in the neighbourhood continues to be encouraged; ○ Conditions of existing low-income housing in the DTES are improved; and ○ A range of supports provides basic needs such as food and health services as well as inclusion and belonging. • These principles support the city-wide principles of supporting a range of affordable housing options to meet the diverse needs of the community
Principle 3 – Local Economy	• Planning in the DTES strives to ensure: ○ The formal economy connects to local needs and livelihoods ○ Community economic; development is encouraged and supported; ○ Retail and mixed-use centres serving local needs are encouraged; ○ Local business is supported and barriers to establishing business are reduced; ○ Residents are given opportunities to earn a living that at a minimum, pays for their basic needs; ○ Social enterprises are encouraged; ○ Local hiring and social purchasing policies are a priority; ○ Volunteerism and the informal economy are recognized; ○ Opportunities for employment in local business, social enterprise, green / high tech and micro enterprises are created; and ○ Industrial job space is preserved while accommodating new uses and processes, which align with the evolving economy • These principles support the city-wide principle of fostering a robust, resilient economy
Principle 4 – Health and Well-being	• Planning in the DTES strives to ensure: ○ Residents’ basic health and social support needs are met to improve the quality of life (especially for vulnerable residents, women, and children); ○ There is improved community safety, access to nutrition, addiction, mental health and other health supports; and, ○ Residents’ sense of community belonging, inclusion, dignity and safety, which is fundamental to achieving a healthy neighbourhood, improved • These principles support the city-wide principle of fostering resilient, sustainable, safe, and healthy communities
Principle 5 – Art, Culture, and Heritage	• Planning in the DTES strives to ensure: ○ The arts, culture, and heritage assets of the area are identified and key assets are protected; ○ The local creative economy is strengthened; ○ Community arts and artists are supported and celebrated; and ○ The area’s diverse cultural heritage is recognized and celebrated (including Aboriginal, Japanese-Canadian, Chinese-Canadian, labour movement, etc.) • These principles support the city-wide principle of enhancing culture, heritage, and creativity within the city

Principle 6 – Transportation	• Planning in the DTES strives to ensure: ○ Transportation networks and connections, particularly for walking and cycling, within and through the DTES are convenient, comfortable and safe for people of all ages and abilities; ○ Residents with disabilities and other physical challenges are mobile; ○ Access to transit is improved; and ○ Improvements to pedestrian safety and comfort on major streets are sought • These principles support the city-wide principle of providing and supporting a range of sustainable transportation options
Principle 7 – Parks and Public Open Space	• Planning in the DTES strives to ensure: ○ Neighbourhood safety and accessibility is improved (lighting, quality of sidewalks, transportation networks); ○ Public parks and open/green spaces are improved and increased; ○ Public outdoor recreation facilities for all sectors of society (seniors, children, youth, and adults) are improved and increased and offer opportunities for marginalized residents to access basic hygiene facilities – showers, public toilets, etc.); ○ Spaces for vulnerable people are provided and protected; and ○ All residents feel at home in their neighbourhood • The principles support the city-wide principle of providing and enhancing public open spaces, parks, and green linkages

The local area plan for the Downtown Eastside identifies seven areas of focus that outline key issues to be maintained, ranging from health and well being to transportation. Similar to the Guiding Principles and Assumptions of the Healthy City Strategy, these areas remain consistent across the entire city.

Promoting Social Justice and Social Sustainability through Systemic Support

In recent years, the City of Vancouver has been responsible for a number of initiatives aimed at improving quality of life in the Downtown Eastside. Specifically, *A Healthy City for All: Vancouver's Healthy City Strategy* (2014), the *Downtown Eastside Social Impact Assessment* (2014), and the *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan* (2014) have incrementally worked together in an attempt to prevent gentrification within DTES neighbourhoods and to protect the lives of low-income and vulnerable populations currently living in the area. Past

efforts were seen in the areas of housing, substance abuse, and economic revitalization, but often these directions saw significant overlap with no coordination of services. Through the identification of targeted goals and priorities, the City has clarified roles and aligned tools that address complex issues through the enhancement of partnerships, innovative approaches, and evidence-based decision making. It is hoped these new plans will assist in long-range planning and development and build upon the strengths of past plans, policies, and programs (City of Vancouver, 2014).

Looking at the Healthy City Strategy, the three major areas of focus are healthy people, healthy communities, and healthy environments. These three overarching themes inform 13 long-term goals, with specific indicators of where Vancouver would like to be by the year 2025. For each goal, three to five indicators are used to measure progress, including changes over time, comparison with other cities, and / or variation between neighbourhoods (City of Vancouver, 2014). For example, “Goal 5: Making Ends Meet and Working Well”, intends for all residents to “have adequate income to cover the costs of basic necessities, and have access to a broad range of healthy employment opportunities” (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 13). The targets for Goal 5 include reducing the city’s poverty rate by 75% by 2025 and increasing the median income by at least 3% every year until then. The bulk of strategy details the research and engagement process for each goal, outlining key findings, what the City heard, with the City’s role and key contributions. In the case of Goal 5, what the City heard included the need for more affordable housing options, opportunities for sharing goods and services, a poverty reduction strategy, supports for social enterprise, and more job training opportunities (City of Vancouver, 2014). From this, the City summarized their proposed role and contributions to achieve this, including “ensuring equitable access to City programs and services” and “building community capacity

through grants and other community supports” (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 29). The City acknowledges the strategy requires “new ways of thinking, innovation, and most of all collaboration and partnership” to reach their goals and ultimate vision of ‘a healthy city for all’ (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 4).

The development of the Healthy City Strategy centered on the participation of more than 10,000 people through different forms of public engagement (City of Vancouver, 2014). These participatory processes included “an online platform, Twitter conversations, the City website, in-person workshops, Ideas Labs, and dialogues with various groups” (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 4). According to a Senior Planner for the DTES (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015):

Everyone has an opportunity to have a fair voice and be heard and respect the fact that all ideas are welcomed, that no one idea should dominate and control the conversation. Transparency and information-sharing is a principal that I feel very strongly about because unless everyone has that equal access there's marginalization of the vulnerable and the less advantaged and they are unable to engage fully with complete understanding, so before embarking on any planning process I believe in the principal of ensuring that everybody is assisted to have a full understanding of the issues and the technical data and whatever else is required to enable them empower them to be part of the conversation.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *inclusivity* and *equality* are symptoms of *social sustainability* and evident in the engagement processes of the DTES. The Managing Director of Social Policy spoke about inclusion in the DTES like this (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015):

I think one of the things around the DTES Local Area Plan that is very challenging and really, really difficult, was seeing the various people around the table. Very low-income, the Aboriginal community, the representation around business and all business, and figuring out how do you engage everybody. It's very, very difficult, very, very challenging, and what it means is that sometimes your plans are going to take longer but they're going to be better and you're going to have the backing and you're going to have the results in a much, much better way.

These examples of *social cooperation* and *group participation* are signs of *social justice* and clearly present throughout the inclusive engagement processes that have occurred in the DTES.

Due to the DTES' close proximity to the downtown core and significantly lower land values, there had been increasing pressure to develop the neighbourhood with new, high-income households within the predominantly low-income community. This led to growing concerns of displacement from residents over the potential impacts of development in the neighbourhood (City of Vancouver, 2014). To understand the context preceding the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) for the DTES, an overarching theme of poverty was highlighted in all areas, as evidenced by a lack of affordable housing, the proportion of low-income households, an increase in social assistance cases, increases in crime, and prevalence of child vulnerability (City of Vancouver, 2014). In response to these growing concerns, Vancouver City Council recommended a SIA be undertaken in "parallel process" with the DTES Local Area Planning Program (LAPP) "to ensure that future development in the DTES improves the lives of all those who currently live in the area, particularly those with low-incomes" (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 1). A SIA is an internationally recognized tool that analyzes, monitors, and manages the intended and unintended social impacts of development on people (City of Vancouver, 2014). International guidelines and principles established by the International Association for Impact Assessment "identify social impacts in order to maximize the positive effects and minimize the negative effects of development on a community in an anticipatory and proactive way" (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 1). SIAs help to ensure resident inclusion in "processes that shape their surroundings" and those that "can significantly affect their lives" (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 1). Proving significant to Vancouver's Healthy City Strategy, research proved how social impacts from neighbourhood development can negatively affect the health and well being of resident lifestyle, quality of life, and their emotional state. To prevent this, the work of the SIA centered on five key objectives (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 2):

- Protect existing assets by maintaining, creating new, or relocating assets where they are accessible to vulnerable populations;
- Fill identified gaps through development, where possible, and through partnerships;
- Create SIA planning tools for use in future planning and development;
- Maximize positive impacts and minimize negative impacts of new developments on vulnerable residents;
- Achieve better development outcomes.

The SIA was implemented through integration with the DTES Local Area Plan (LAP) and implemented new policy directions through a Social Impact Management Framework (City of Vancouver, 2014). Also, the SIA promised to work “in partnership with community representatives and local Business Improvement Associations (BIA) to help achieve healthier development outcomes over time” (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 41).

The framework for the SIA was comprised of four complementary components: a Community Asset Management Program, a Community-Based Development Program, Regulatory Tools, and Good Neighbour Practices. The SIA was supervised and evaluated through social impact indicators every three years in connection with the DTES LAP. These indicators monitored the status of community assets and the effects of development on low-income and vulnerable residents. The outlined strategies not only intended to protect these identified community assets, but also to stabilize affordable rental housing units through community-based development (City of Vancouver, 2014). Regulatory tools for the Social Management Framework included policies, by-laws and guidelines to manage land use and development, and ensure new developments fit within the existing neighbourhood (City of Vancouver, 2014). Community evaluation tools also gave residents the opportunity to be part of deciding which businesses were brought into their community. A Senior Planner for the DTES described such tools like this (Personal Communication, February 23 2015):

Establishing community evaluation tools, which we would use to help the community have a consistent voice on applications that come in for new development and new business licenses, to assess whether or not they feel that those applications sit with the Plan and are delivering the objectives of the Plan.

The DTES SIA and LAP gave residents opportunity to be involved in a number of development processes within their neighbourhood. As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *inclusion* and *equality* are signs of *social sustainability* and clearly present through the equal inclusion of countless residents in decision-making in the DTES.

The SIA and Local Area Planning Program (LAPP) processes took place concurrently and in collaboration from October 2011 to March 2013. However, “the broader visioning process, which started at the early stage of the Plan, was facilitated by at least ten or 15 years of a number of neighbourhood planning exercises that had [previously] been carried out” (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015). The SIA and LAPP worked in partnership for the development of many areas including demographic information, community engagement activities, and informing round tables for the prevention of social impacts (City of Vancouver, 2014). More than 600 residents, representatives of vulnerable populations, and the LAPP Committee Reference Group shaped key themes and impact areas of the SIA through the following five steps (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 4, 5):

- Step 1 – Understanding the Context and Issues
- Step 2 – Engaging the Community
- Step 3 – Assessing Potential Impacts of Development
- Step 4 – Managing Community Assets
- Step 5 – Monitoring Community Assets

According to a Senior Planner for the DTES (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015):

Our approach was to deliberately design the committee and the engagement process to favour the voice of the vulnerable, non-formal sector, the low-income community residents. The structure of the committee that we used, and also the mechanism by which

we meet people, is to ensure that firstly there's a majority of women and that we reach out to the representatives of the low-income residents, the non-profit support agencies and social groups that are working with the vulnerable people.

Thus, the engagement processes elicited for the SIA and LAPP targeted and involved the most vulnerable and underrepresented residents groups. This example of *inclusivity* is an indication of *social sustainability* and clearly evident throughout the engagement approaches of the LAPP and SIA.

Another example of *inclusivity* can be seen through the creation of “safe space[s], [...] particularly for women and for the Aboriginal representatives who were, quite often, reluctant to speak out” (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015). Workshops were designed to include various vulnerable populations and offered refreshments and childcare, with a small honorarium for participation. In addition to the workshops, individual interviews were conducted with residents in single room occupancies and busy street corners, so marginalized residents who would not normally attend a workshop were able to participate. According to a Senior Planner in the DTES (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015):

We also went out to individual meetings in the community with the Indigenous population groups, with their various representative groups [...] the Japanese Canadian Community [...] the Chinese Community [...] on top of that we attended the various festivals and in community events with tables with banners with information with products from the plan to be able to guide and get input from the various members attending out in the various events and festivals that were being held each year [...] We also hired a couple of Aboriginal residents to work on the City staff to give them some skills and transfer knowledge. We also employed local community residents to distribute information to distribute documents to help us set up meetings. They were paid an honorarium for helping us set up and take down all the workshops and all of the events, so it was a partnership rather than them being just passengers in the process.

Not only did the SIA and LAPP attempt to engage residents by going directly into the community, they also approached existing resident groups to elicit participation and promote others to do so as well. As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *community*

development and *group participation* are signs of *social justice* and are evident through Indigenous residents working in partnership with City staff in LAPP and SIA engagement processes.

Aligned with the Healthy City Strategy goals, the DTES Local Area Plan (LAP) attempts to “facilitate opportunities for individuals and families” to become healthy people, living in healthy communities, with healthy environments (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 3). Using a timeframe of 30 years with ten-year targets, the plan outlines key issues, directions, priorities, strategies, actions and projects to be implemented. This innovative implementation approach sought to “protect critical community assets, support vulnerable residents, stabilize affordable rental housing stock and create positive opportunities for all through community-based development” (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 7). A Senior Planner in the DTES described the plan like this (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015):

It wasn't just a plan which had some lofty words and high-level policies. They actually drilled down into specific quick-start, short-term, medium-, and long-term projects as well. And that's why we've been able to now take that plan within a year and start implementing and rolling out about \$1.8-million in capital funds already, and see the community itself working together to implement some of the projects without us even needing to tell them what to do. They're doing it themselves.

Furthermore, to ensure market housing proceeded without displacing low-income residents or gentrifying the area, the LAP was based on several conceptual approaches (City of Vancouver, 2014):

- Provide affordable housing choices for all incomes
- Create social housing and provide housing choice for the homeless
- Maintain and enhance the level of affordability that currently exists
- Improve living conditions for those living in single room occupancies
- Assist vulnerable residents in dealing with mental health and addiction issues to find and maintain housing

- Motivate strategic partnerships with other levels of governments, developers, and non-profits to build social housing, increase social / health supports, and improve affordability
- Motivate senior levels of government to provide adequate levels of income supports to those on Income Assistance so the costs of basic necessities are covered and increase access to employment / volunteer opportunities
- Enhance feelings of inclusion, belonging, and safety for all, with a focus on greater safety for seniors, women, and children
- Secure critical community assets (inexpensive healthy food, showers, social service agencies, gathering spaces) which existing residents need to thrive
- Develop an inclusive, mixed local economy that focuses on retaining existing businesses, attracting new businesses that fit into the neighbourhood, and enhance local employment opportunities
- Protect neighbourhood culture, heritage, and unique character
- Prioritize walking, cycling, transit, while seeking to improve livability and accessibility
- Invest in arts and culture, and increase opportunities for local artists
- Implement an innovative Social Impact Management Framework linked to a Community-based Development area so community assets are protected and a good neighbourhood fit is encouraged for new developments and businesses

Additionally, LAP roundtable sessions and public outreach events allowed community members and stakeholders opportunity for input on outlined themes. Community members were also able to create vision statements they felt were important for the community and all statements were collected and translated into this collective vision statement for the DTES (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 23):

The Downtown Eastside (DTES) will continue to be a neighbourhood of communities providing sustainable, safe and healthy places for everyone to live and work. These communities will continue to value and cherish unique characteristics, including diversity, economic mix, culture and heritage. The neighbourhood will be made up of mixed-income communities with a range of affordable housing options (including social

housing) for all residents, local serving commerce, social services and cultural activities where all feel welcome, valued and at home.

Through the implementation of the DTES LAP, approximately “605 new job opportunities, 35 new childcare spaces, improve[d] community asset space, offices, equipment, [and] machinery” have been generated for the community (Personal Communication, February 23, 2014). These examples of *community development* are an indication of *social justice* and have positively effected change in the DTES. Specific projects have also greatly contributed to the development of the DTES. For example, a Senior Planner in the DTES summarized one such project like this (Personal Communication, February 23, 2014):

Another project that we very encouraged, that we didn't start but the community started, is a street Wi-Fi project, which involves two BIA's getting together with the community centre, the street market committee, the local non-profits, Vancouver Community Network, and local residents in putting together a Wi-Fi system where there are hotspots at various places, where they didn't exist before. And those community Wi-Fi resources, or infrastructure, are now enabling people to hook up and go online, do job searches, get information, give information, communicate, and out of that the one community centre has formed a project together with the urban Aboriginal group, to work with the youth and give them connectivity to the digital world, to help them get access to better information and improve graduation scores and graduation rates in the Aboriginal community.

Innovative projects such as this have also increased the likelihood of change in the DTES. As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *increased access to public services* is a symptom of *social sustainability* and clearly present through the increase in Wi-Fi access for DTES community members. Other opportunities for economic development have included “street populations and the whole issue around vending and street vending street populations and income gaps and disparities” (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). According to the Managing Director of Social Policy (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015):

We can't wait. It's been 7 years since the welfare rates have increased. People are vending for a living [...] so [we are] try[ing] [to] create space in the city for people to have a legal way [to] vend and use goods in a legal way [...] Again, we're working through process

and regulations around that, [and] that [...] had huge involvement from the low-income community and [...] [we hope that] the existing street market that is underway now would be in a position to be able to create opportunities for vending, not just one day a week, but three or four days a week.

Offering employment opportunity based on existing resident practices have also increased the likelihood of change in the DTES. According to a Senior Planner in the DTES, they are “working towards trying to find the market a permanent home where they can operate more days of the week and diversify the market and allow other groups to start getting involved” (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015). As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *community development* is an indication of *social justice* and *social networks* are an indication of *social sustainability* and both can be seen through the creation of space for street markets and vendors throughout the DTES.

The City intends to review the LAP regularly “to set new targets on the basis of achievements and changes over time” (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 7). While greater attention was clearly given to the DTES during the formulation of its LAP, the City “worked very cross-departmentally” to focus on social planning across the entire city and the Healthy City Strategy during this time (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). The Managing Director of Social Policy explained the focus like this (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015):

The focus is across the city, and why the focus is across the city, of course we do pay more attention to communities where there is more despair. One of the things I will say is that we are seeing disadvantage right across the city as we see the income gap grow. The income gap is growing and great poverty is on the rise [...] the numbers of homeless are getting larger, not smaller despite the efforts of ourselves and other levels of government that address homelessness. So that's where the outlook and I think it's important that the City, from my perspective, look at the whole city, not just focus efforts in one particular neighbourhood, even though we do want to put more emphasis in those neighbourhoods because there's obvious reasons for doing that.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *equality* is a sign of *social sustainability* and is evident through the focus of social planning across the entire city of Vancouver, instead of only focusing on a singular neighbourhood such as the DTES.

The final chapter of the LAP is essential in creating meaningful change in the quality of life of DTES residents. This chapter recognizes existing City programs and initiatives, as well as new approaches, to be used throughout the plan. This final approach, or Action Plan, is the most crucial element of the DTES LAP (City of Vancouver, 2014). Additionally, the “Aboriginal Place-making” section of the LAP recognizes the significant meaning the DTES holds for Indigenous groups, as this area has the highest Indigenous population in Vancouver. In working with the Indigenous community through the preparation of the LAP, there was an expressed need to improve efforts to include and plan for Indigenous people living in the area. This recognition centered on the inclusion of facilities for traditional healing practices, ceremonies, and other activities. Furthermore, City Council proclaimed 2013 was a ‘Year of Reconciliation’ with the Aboriginal community (City of Vancouver, 2014). This was monumental for the legacy going forward in the DTES, as this encouraged a commitment “to build shared understanding of the past, and create a meaningful legacy of a new way forward into the future” (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 49). For the DTES, this meant adequately supporting the Indigenous community “in finding ways for Aboriginal place-making [...] be it through innovative intergenerational Aboriginal housing projects, programming, public art” or other strategies (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 49). Specifically, there are three policies regarding Aboriginal Place-making in the DTES (City of Vancouver, 2014, p. 49, 50):

1. Foster strong relationships between the City and Aboriginal organizations and residents in the DTES towards ongoing collaboration and engagement in addressing neighbourhood issues and areas of common concern.

2. Support the Aboriginal community in their pursuit of the establishment of an area or site of meaningful community activity and amenity.
3. Explore partnerships and opportunities to develop intergenerational Aboriginal housing projects and a healing and wellness centre in the Downtown Eastside.

Other examples of projects and initiatives currently happening within the DTES include the creation of a community Task Force, activities around housing, revitalization, and heritage building conservation. A Task Force was created to elicit the help and expertise of people with lived experience, to engage and involve other community members using different mechanisms to ensure representation and engagement of different groups. These groups include: very low-income, the Aboriginal community, and the business community (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). Also, there is a process of continually reviewing, revisiting and revising how to move forward with housing in the DTES. Current applications for housing developments should begin to take shape within the next three to five years. Seniors Housing may also be coming to the forefront of development in the DTES as another delivery need which wasn't prioritized three years ago, but now is seen as a need for community members (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015). Furthermore, there has been pronounced development toward issues surrounding single room occupancy accommodation, with a by-law being created to protect existing housing until new housing could be secured for low-income and vulnerable residents (Personal Communication, March 6, 2015). Chinatown has successfully completed three years of revitalization projects, with empty shops and desolate buildings now almost completely removed from the area. The Chinese Society Buildings Project works to protect and maintain the heritage character of Chinatown, as this proved very important to community members. A Capital Program was created to assist in the repair of a number of Society Buildings estimated to be more than 100 years old, with Council approving nearly \$2.5-million in grants to

support this (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015). These examples of *group participation* and *social cooperation* are signs of *social justice*, and *increased access to public services* is an indication of *social sustainability*. Each is clearly evident throughout the many projects attempting to effect change in DTES neighbourhoods.

In conclusion, systemic support provided by the City of Vancouver in the DTES is based on the need to preserve existing assets, while attempting to protect the most disadvantaged and vulnerable populations. What remains clear through the SIA and LAP processes is how disadvantaged community members were ultimately given a voice. Consequently, there were also times this caused the more advantaged groups to say they were “not going to attend ... [not] going to participate in the plan because they felt that they'd been ignored or rebuffed” (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015). As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *social exclusion* and *lack of integrated social networks* are signs of being *socially unsustainable* and also clearly present in some of the social planning activities occurring throughout the DTES. Thus, a more equal balance between residents is required to adequately support those living in the DTES.

Promoting Indigenous Justice and the Sustainability of Indigenous Communities Through the Creation of an Indigenous Social Planner

The most distinctive characteristic of social planning by the City of Vancouver was the period in which an Indigenous Social Planner was employed. From 1999 to 2006 the Social Planning Department in Vancouver was abuzz with “lots of different areas of work, and lots of people that could focus in on certain communities” (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). During this time, a number of staff were personally committed to social justice and social

inclusion, and were able to concentrate on specific areas such as childcare, youth outreach, community grants, food policy, culture, and the needs of seniors and women. Greater attention was also given to Indigenous groups through the establishment of a position within the Social Planning Department specifically for Indigenous peoples (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). Initiated by the City Manager, this position was unique because it demonstrated *recognition* through an understanding of how the municipal government could be more *inclusive*, *equitable* and sensitive to the needs of Indigenous groups in the area. According to the previous Aboriginal Social Planner, it was unique for the City Manager to recognize this because the City itself had not recognized it: “it was almost like a quiet thing that [the City Manager] did, dedicating these hours and realizing that it really wasn't being addressed anywhere, across all departments” (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). The overall mandate of the position was to “build bridges between the City and the Aboriginal community” and the position was described like this (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015):

[There] was never a concern for the Aboriginal community, for the First Nations, for Indigenous people. It was completely disconnected from the Aboriginal community and First Nations themselves, and I was committed to seeing that change. I was committed to seeing the City recognize that they were on Indigenous land and needed to work with the local First Nations [...] But I mean more of what I did was probably advocacy, for myself and my own perspective of what I thought needed to happen. I also worked a lot with the First Nations, which hadn't really been done. A lot of people hadn't really seen it as an issue because we were only supposed to work with urban Aboriginal people and I was told many times that the First Nations within the Vancouver area were a Federal issue, and to me that was a total contradiction. Like if you're working with Aboriginal people you definitely need to work with the Indigenous people of Vancouver.

Thus, the creation of an Indigenous Social Planner by the City of Vancouver symbolized recognition by the municipal government to make Indigenous issues a priority. This instance of *equality*, *inclusivity*, *increased access to public services*, and *recognition* are signs of *social sustainability* and clearly evident through the creation of this position. It is important to

acknowledge this innovative approach because it recognized the needs and requirements of Indigenous residents living in the city at that time. However, this renowned and pioneering approach to social planning has not continued to the present day.

The position centered on supporting Indigenous residents through grant provisions and the creation of creative projects (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). In the DTES this meant placemaking by “identifying places and spaces for Aboriginal healing and wellness to take place” through mapping exercises and other activities with the Indigenous community because “a lot of Aboriginal people, in particular, were feeling voiceless [...] not seen, not included” (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). One of the first projects involved the gathering of stories, where youth were hired to interview Indigenous people who had stories to share in the DTES (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). This was important because “for a lot of people just telling their story and being heard and having a voice [was] huge” (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). By researching different views and giving Indigenous groups a voice within their community, stories were recorded as oral histories and the videos were eventually shown at public screenings. Later, these stories were turned into storyboards, each with a photograph of the storyteller and a quote from the interviewee. Finally, a book was created called *Storyscapes: Aboriginal Stories of Vancouver* (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). The previous Aboriginal Social Planner spoke about one youth’s outlook once the project was completed: “he had this completely different view of that neighbourhood and of the Aboriginal community, and he had this completely different goal of making sure that those stories [were] known and making them more visible” (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *inclusivity* and *having a sense*

of community are symptoms of *social sustainability*, and *community development* is an indicator of *social justice*; each of these components were present through the Storyscapes project.

Other examples of projects and initiatives that occurred during the Aboriginal Social Planner's time within the Social Planning Department included Storyscapes Chinatown, the Dialogues Project, the creation of a Youth Outreach Team, and an Elders Training Program. Storyscapes Chinatown centered on improving relationships between the Chinese and Indigenous communities. Working through their apparent disconnect, this project sought to unite these groups and make their common histories more clear. These two groups have intersected in many ways including being war veterans, intermarriage, public art and their experiences of being excluded in their early days of settlement. The Dialogues Project gave residents opportunity to share their views, experiences, and cultural exchanges through 'dialogue circles'. Some circles saw Musqueam and Anishinabe people bringing each other into their space to eat, and other circles had different religious and cultural groups do the same. The City funded these events as celebrations and cultural events for community groups. In addition, a youth outreach team was created to design programs that directly addressed the needs of young people, to ultimately connect youth with the City. In order to assist Indigenous elders with the responsibility of being an elder, an Elders Training Program offered learning opportunities to reconnect them with their culture and provide opportunities to share their experiences with Indigenous youth (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). These examples of *equality* and *social networks* are signs of *social sustainability*, and *social cooperation* is an indication of *social justice*. Each of these components was present in the unique projects and initiatives that occurred during the previous Aboriginal Social Planner's time with the City of Vancouver.

5.3 Comparative analysis: How model integration could more effectively endorse the principles of social sustainability and social justice

Through the comparative analysis of these two research sites, many marked similarities and differences between these two social planning approaches have become clear. First, in terms of similarities, each interviewee believes more could always be done within their communities. The Community Development Director for NECRC said this (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015):

I think more can be done, but it all has to do with the funding. We have that NRF Fund, and that's the fund where my committee then makes recommendations on the actual funding to these proposals. And there's proposals that come through that sometimes aren't funded or are not funded adequately.

Additionally, the previous Executive Director for the SPCW explained how funding concerns are a reciprocal relationship, where governments also experience apprehension (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

For example, I know that a lot of governments fear that these advocates are only demanding more money, and that is a part of poverty reduction, but also, I think governments can open up doors for collaborations [...] I think governments can help change policy that may not cost a lot, but will benefit people.

The previous Aboriginal Social Planner for the City of Vancouver believes the disconnect between the public and private sector is to blame (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015):

Funding is always an issue. Awareness is another issue. I think people feel intimidated. They don't know who to go to, they don't know who the community members are, who the organizations are. That's cop-out but it's true. A lot of people don't have that connection, and so if a staff member like myself can help them have that connection and that knowledge, then it's a lot easier for them to do that work. And I saw that, once they knew those people, once they knew those organizations it became much more comfortable in knowing how to approach them and include them.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), these funding gaps and the resultant *inability to meet needs of current generations* through funding is a sign of being *not socially sustainable*.

Second, both approaches believe each resident is equally important. The previous Executive Director for the SPCW gave an example of how attitudes around poverty need to change (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

Right now I think a lot people feel poverty is a burden on society, it attacks requirement, and that many people in poverty are there because of a lack of their initiative or people taking responsibility for their lives. They want to blame the poor in effect. I think we have to change attitudes to emphasize that poverty is a product of our society, in that it's something that we all have a responsibility in addressing.

The previous Aboriginal Social Planner for the City of Vancouver went on further to state how society needs to function on a more collective basis and how all citizens should be considered equal (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015):

The definition of the public, I think, for a lot of cities needs to change. People think that just 'property-owning, tax-paying' stereotype of the public, and not recognizing everybody as part of the public. No matter how uncomfortable you may feel with people that are homeless or are struggling with addiction, they are still citizens [...] Everybody needs to have a voice.

These outlined examples of *social exclusion* are an indication of being *not socially sustainable* and clearly remain issues for both social planning models.

Third, both models believe more cross-departmental partnership and communication is required at this time of writing. The Community Development Director for NECRC had this to say about a program offered by a third party organization who did not communicate with NECRC prior to commencing, "the program could fail because it's offered in the evening instead of the daytime just because they haven't talked, and it's amazing because they've never talked" (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015). The Managing Director of Social Policy explained

how different levels of government are not working together as they should (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015):

I think sometimes what's missing of course is the willingness of senior levels of government to work with us. We did our best to make that happen and sometimes there's not much you can do about that, depending on where other levels of government are at. I think that's always a real challenge.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *lack of integrated social networks* is an indication of being *not socially sustainable* and clear through the lack of cross-departmental partnership or communication in the DTES and North End. However, it is clear Winnipeg's social planning model demonstrates a greater ability to create meaningful and lasting relationships through its many informal partnerships. Perhaps the City of Vancouver could look to non-profit organizations like those in Winnipeg to advance their interdepartmental partnerships.

Fourth, housing and homelessness remain major issues in both the DTES and North End. According to The Managing Director of Social Policy, "housing is critical" (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). A previous Senior Planner for the City of Vancouver said strong social housing programs remain very challenging to achieve (Personal Communication, March 6, 2015). The previous Aboriginal Social Planner for the City of Vancouver added this (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015):

I get really frustrated when Vancouver boasts how it's 'the most liveable city in the world' and what a good quality of life everybody enjoys, and it kind of glosses over the fact that a very large community of people does not get to experience Vancouver in that way, and we have no right to make those claims until all residents get to enjoy that quality of life.

In Winnipeg, the Community Animator for the SPCW said, "homeownership is important but that's not our priority, it's safe housing for everyone that lives there" (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). Furthermore, they went on to mention "increasing incomes, increasing the

access to affordable housing, community development, and equity in social programming” as goals they hope to achieve in the near future (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *inability to meet needs of current generations* is an indication of being *not socially sustainable* and these characteristics are currently present within the DTES and North End neighbourhoods.

Next, the social planning models of both Winnipeg and Vancouver recognize the many underlying and interrelated issues causing and perpetuating poverty within their most disadvantaged neighbourhoods. The previous Executive Director for the SPCW put it like this (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

People in poverty are not there because they want to be. Right now we are dealing a lot with issues of racism and people living in poverty, that undermines not only the esteem and the ability of people themselves, but it undermines the capacity of our whole society to function.

The Managing Director of Social Policy explained it like this (Personal Communication, February 20, 2014):

Until people are properly housed, would be the first thing, and then addressing the income gap in whatever way we can, through social entrepreneurship through other types of employment. Where we know some of our low-income people aren't able to work a full day and those are some of the issues that we're looking at is: how do we get support for these people so that they can at least make a contribution towards their income? But the basics are how do you alleviate poverty.

These examples of *social exclusion* are signs of being *not socially sustainable* and clearly evident in the lack of poverty reduction in DTES and North End neighbourhoods.

Finally, both social planning models agree that vulnerable populations need better and more equal access to integrated services. A Senior Planner for the DTES explained this example (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015):

Possibly in the distribution of information, we suffered a lot from the fact that a lot of people in the DTES are not on the Internet. So distribution of information was very difficult and we could have spent a little bit more time in getting information out to

residents. In a more physical sense of distribution of information and creating portals for people in their places of residence, for example, if we'd had more time and if we'd had more resources [...] We are in an information age and planners tend to dilute everybody with a lot of information, and the disadvantaged community struggles. They don't have access to printers; they don't have access to computer equipment making them incapable of downloading 3MB of data, big documents, and a lot of their resources crashed. They have problems; they don't have access to cellular phones to communicate with each other. I feel that they need a lot more resource assistance, which we don't normally give. And I think that the only way that you can really empower the disadvantaged community is to address those resource needs and support needs.

While residents in the DTES are lacking access to common resources, the previous Executive Director for the SPCW explained how Neighbourhood Associations in the North End have been able to provide adequate social supports for residents who also lack common resources through service integration (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

This [...] was process where we wanted to make sure that the community, and particularly the Neighbourhood Association, really were involved throughout and really felt that it was useful for them. So there were not just meetings and discussions, but [...] was able to bring in some of the other local agencies that were involved in providing social supports because even though we're talking about housing we knew that it had to be integrated with other community development, social services, and other developments that were taking place in the neighbourhood.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *reduced access to public services* is an indication of being *not socially sustainable* and clearly present in both the DTES and North End. However, residents associations in the North End have recognized this and attempted service integration to make access easier for residents.

In terms of differences between these two social planning models, first, the Winnipeg model believes City leadership is greatly missing but maintain that losing front-line leadership from grassroots organizations is also not ideal. A Community Animator with the SPCW explained how the City of Winnipeg should assume greater responsibility for certain issues, but should also take on supportive roles for others (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

Much of their work is trying to get the City to do what they should be doing anyway and that's really unfortunate [...] I mean I would hate to see the City takeover a lot of the good work that has been done, like the City doesn't have to do it. It's really that supportive role and that funding role they should be taking on [...] and it seems to me we need some sort of 'in-between' here in Winnipeg [...] Social planning should not only be a Social Planning Council with no formal connection to the City, but we play an important role and we would hate for the City to take that over. So the City does need to participate but not lead.

On the topic of initiating the conversation for the future of the North End's notorious CPR rail yards, the previous Executive Director for the SPCW said this about City leadership (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015):

That's a huge project, it will take a long time, and it will take a lot of political, social, cultural and environmental attention. But frankly, that will happen within the next 10 or 15 years and I think it's a role that no one else could play other than the Social Planning Council. We were able to challenge the authorities, we were able to open up a discourse with the Railway and the community and the three levels of government.

These instances of being unable to adequately support the *needs of current generations* are indications of being *not socially sustainable* through the lack of civic leadership within North End neighbourhoods.

Second, the City of Vancouver recognizes how there has been an inadequate amount of consultation with many community members. A Senior Planner for the DTES spoke about how "the other group consistently stayed off, and then some of the more advantaged business groups tended to get frustrated because they felt that they're busy people and they want this Plan to be done and dusted" (Personal Communication, February 23, 2015). The previous Aboriginal Social Planner spoke about lack of consultation like this (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015):

People felt that they were not part of the process at all. So basically what I would say was the biggest shortcoming, and probably continues to this day but I'm not sure, is that staff would work more with service providers. They would meet with service providers at different agencies but not necessarily the people that were being helped or not the community people themselves, not the grassroots [...] and in many cases those service providers didn't live in the area, or they weren't necessarily in touch with what the people really wanted. I mean yes of course they can speak for the people who they're there to serve, who you know in some ways. I think in other ways what I was hearing from quite a few people was that, sure there's lots of consultation happening but they're not actually

hearing from the grassroots residents [...] That sort of just an assumption a lot of people had, maybe more in those days than now, that as long as you're working with the service providers you're reaching the public, but that's not necessarily the case.

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *inability to meet needs of current generations, social exclusion, and lack of integrated social networks* are symptoms of being *not socially sustainable* and clearly present through the lack of adequate consultation with many DTES residents.

Third, in Winnipeg it is evident most grassroots and community organizations operate on different and unequal levels. Through speaking with the SPCW and NECRC, it became clear how many organizations lose funding due to an inability to keep up with reporting requirements outlined and required by the Province. According to the Community Development Director for NECRC (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015):

Each Residents Association is at a different level and it all depends on their volunteers and their staff and the drive. We've got three associations, actually four, three of them have a full-time worker, one of them has a part-time worker and it really depends on the level of the community [...] They have asked us to set up a residents advisory committee from the North End. So I have residents from probably about eight neighbourhoods in the North End [...] and actually five receive funding, but we have representation from a little bit more and we meet monthly to look at proposals going to the NRF Fund [...] They look at the actual organization, their reputation, can they do it? Do they have a good reputation to do it? Do they have the capacity to do it?

As discussed in the Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3.0), *reduced access to public services* is a sign of being *not socially sustainable* and clearly evident through the inability of grassroots organizations in Winnipeg to operate on equal levels.

Finally, the City of Vancouver is unprecedented and paramount in their formal recognition of their presence on Indigenous land. The Managing Director of Social Policy explained how Vancouver first declared “a Year of Reconciliation with Aboriginal peoples, and now it's considered itself a City of Reconciliation”, with a number of initiatives happening across

the city and numerous places for Indigenous healing and wellness identified in the DTES

(Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). The previous Aboriginal Social Planner spoke

about the recognition and reconciliation like this (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015):

Having the City recognize that not only was the Aboriginal community an important community, but that it actually had the highest level of need in terms of not enjoying a good quality of life that Vancouver has. They definitely needed the most support and attention to address the huge imbalances and inequality, the disproportionate struggles the Aboriginal communities needed to be a priority for the City overall, but also recognizing that that community had contributed a great deal to building Vancouver. Particularly Indigenous people had contributed everything, the land, the resources, everything, the labour, everything that created Vancouver. So that needed to be recognized in all of our work. That's what fuelled me. It wasn't just 'oh we'd like to work with the community and make sure everybody gets what they need'. It was like 'there needs to be a fundamental shift in the recognition', [...] because most staff, most departments, other than a few social planners, it was a non-issue. Aboriginal people were irrelevant, except for the DTES, because at that time, that's where the troubles were. That's where lots of Aboriginal people live and to other people it was a non-issue. They just do a project in the west side, they do a project in north, and [when] you do projects there's no need for them to consult with the Aboriginal communities because they are not there [...] I was determined to change that all [...] the difference today is huge.

This example of *political processes that advocate redistribution* and *political processes that advocate community development* are indicators of *social justice*, and *security of future generations*, *inclusivity*, *equality*, and *having a sense of community* are indicators of social sustainability. Each of these characteristics is present through the City of Vancouver's formal recognition of being on Indigenous land.

In terms of policy, there are many marked differences and similarities between these two social planning models. The *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan 2011-2016* (2010) was contracted out and completed by a private firm, whereas municipal government took the lead on the *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan* (2014). As discussed in the previous section, both community plans did a tremendous amount of background research and community profiling to gain a better understanding of the residents currently living in these areas and the

local factors affecting them. Also, both community plans intended to preserve the historic and cultural diversity of North End and DTES neighbourhoods, as these unique characteristics have remained important parts of these communities for generations. Furthermore, both community plans recognize and acknowledge the increasing safety concerns present within their neighbourhoods and have attempted to directly combat these issues through their planning techniques.

The mandate of NECRC is to promote the social, economic and cultural renewal of the North End through a CED approach. From this, specific roles and functions, and defined engagement and relationship building approaches led discussion circles and focus groups. Unique to NECRC's approach was the separation of agreed upon 'sectoral areas' and the prioritization of issues through the distribution of a community survey. It is obvious the City of Vancouver had a more rigorous engagement approach that occurred on a much larger scale, and this could be attributed to factors such as resources, time, and scope. While both community plans were able to identify specific outcomes and indicators of change, the City of Vancouver was able to go into much greater incremental detail than NECRC. However, the Province of Manitoba strengthened NECRC by recognizing the importance of strategic partnerships and grassroots neighbourhood revitalization through NA! programs. NA! grant funding was able to elicit community revitalization strategies and community initiatives that most likely would not have occurred without Provincial support. Lastly, the SPCW and NECRC proved tenacious through their innovative determination to get to know residents on a personal level, by going directly out into North End neighbourhoods and getting to know those that live there.

The City of Vancouver's social planning model must be commended for its unique approach to planning within the DTES. The *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan* (2014) evolved

through the Healthy City Strategy and the accompanying Social Impact Assessment. The City announcing a 'Year of Reconciliation', the City striving to be a 'City of Reconciliation', and the inclusion of Aboriginal placemaking within the Local Area Plan gave more attention to Indigenous groups residing in the area. Other unique characteristics of this approach are how the Healthy City Strategy is part of a three-pillared municipal intervention to community planning within Vancouver, and how it was originally developed from the World Health Organization model. Also, concerns of displacement and gentrification in the DTES sparked the SIA to run in parallel process with the Local Area Planning Program. This unique approach led future development in the DTES in accordance with the interests of vulnerable populations and in alliance with the goals of the Healthy City Strategy. Working cross-departmentally and in partnership with local organizations and BIA's, the SIA was careful to protect the existing characteristics, people and assets of the DTES. Also, greater 'safety nets' and details of planning were evident through this approach (e.g. the Social Impact Management Framework, see pages 72, 73). The *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan* (2014) operates on seven basic principles and these conceptual approaches clearly reflect how they originated from municipal government and, therefore, have greater opportunities for funding than the *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan 2011-2016* (2010) (see pages 78, 79). Also, the Healthy City Strategy, SIA, and *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan* (2014) go into much greater detail than the *5 Year North End Community and Renewal Plan* (2010) and operate on a much larger scale, with thousands more participants throughout their engagement sessions (see pages 84 to 96). Lastly, the creation of strategic partnerships and relationships is similar to the approach within social planning organizations in the North End, but these proved not as personal or successful in the DTES.

5.4 Summary

In summary, the works of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg and the North End Community Renewal Corporation have fundamentally shaped social service enterprise within Winnipeg. Each organization maintains the key to their success lies in the formation and preservation of lasting relationships with community members. The policies upon which these non-profit organizations are founded showcase varying degrees of socially just and socially sustainable practices. The City of Vancouver, however, has clearly demonstrated how political power and systemic intervention are required to more adequately support disadvantaged communities. The City of Vancouver's Aboriginal Social Planner, their ability to reach community members, their formal recognition of Indigenous history and declaration of a 'Year of Reconciliation' with Indigenous groups are clear examples of how a municipally-funded department is able to more easily achieve desired goals. Likewise, the SPCW and NECRC prove how the maintenance of more personal relationships is also essential. Thus, it is evident through this investigation that an integration of both models would be the most ideal situation for disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations.

6.0 Conclusions & Recommendations

6.1 Summary of Findings

Within Winnipeg, there are numerous non-profit organizations that offer social planning services within North End. Specifically, the SPCW heads a range of activities focused on poverty reduction and social inclusion in Winnipeg. The SPCW also takes on general planning activities for the City and their work often involves encouraging more formal responses by local governments to current social issues in Winnipeg. The SPCW attributes much of their success to the many meaningful relationships they have made over the years through their social planning endeavors (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015). Working immediately within the North End, NECRC focuses on economic renewal by bringing the community together through mutual respect and inclusiveness, to coordinate a range of activities around housing, safety, employment, and business development. NECRC credits its success to diminishing conflict in the community and bringing residents together on common issues (Personal Communication, March 13, 2015). While neither of these organizations are run or supported by municipal government, the Province of Manitoba has recognized the value in neighbourhood-level renewal and offers many opportunities for grant funding within the community through the *Neighborhood's Alive! (NA!)* program. This ensures the Province sustains input into capacity-building activities occurring within North End neighbourhoods.

Completed by a private firm, the *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan* (2011) was completed through the direction of the NECRC Board of Directors. Working in partnership with this plan and seen as a response to the declining social, economic, and physical conditions in Manitoba, NA! was created as a means to assist communities in effecting positive change in Winnipeg's Major Improvement Neighbourhoods (Institute of Urban Studies, 2005).

This Provincial program was announced as a “long-term commitment to rebuilding neighbourhoods in need” through “comprehensive, innovative and significant provincial investment” in community-led organizations “for local planning, enhancement projects, economic development and community support programs” (Government of Manitoba, 2000). The extensive consultation and engagement process for the *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan* (2011) began in June 2010 with table discussions at the NECRC’s Annual General Meeting (AGM). These discussions were used as a means to “initiate the overall engagement process with a visible event, and to begin to provide a foundation for future discussions” (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 8). Through the Plan (2011), NECRC was able to identify and explain their roles and functions within North End neighbourhoods. Engagement activities centered on discussion circles and focus groups, were organized around seven sectors, and had satisfactory levels of attendance. A supplementary survey was used and formatted for different community groups as a tool “for on-going group information gathering”, to prioritize initiatives and actions, and identify areas of activity with outcomes and indicators of change (Leskiw & Associates & NECRC, 2011, p. 12). Thus, the social planning practices of the SPCW and NECRC can be characterized as being relationship-based and community-driven, where the creation of strategic partnerships directs and influences all planning practice. Furthermore, the SPCW explored the demographics of participation so as to ensure Indigenous groups were never excluded from making social planning decisions (Personal Communication, February 17, 2015).

Within Vancouver, a stand-alone social planning department differentiates from social planning practice currently present in Winnipeg. At this time of writing, the City of Vancouver Social Planning Department works cross-departmentally and has roles and responsibilities in

“the identification of key social issues in the city, putting forward priorities for Council consideration, as well as Council direction to respond on matters of social nature” (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). Unique to social planning in Vancouver is how the City declared 2014 a ‘Year of Reconciliation’ with Aboriginal peoples, and Vancouver is now considered a ‘City of Reconciliation’ worldwide (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). In addition, greater attention was given to Aboriginal groups with a specific Aboriginal Social Planner existing within the City. The overall mandate of the position centered on “building bridges between the City and the Aboriginal community” (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). In the DTES this meant “identifying places and spaces for Aboriginal healing and wellness to take place” through mapping exercises with the Indigenous community (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015). This was also done across the municipality, as the City recognized Indigenous groups did not only live in the DTES (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015).

Grounded in the World Health Organizations four requirements for change related to urban health and well being, *A Healthy City for All: Vancouver’s Healthy City Strategy* (2014) represents the third of a three-pillared long-term sustainability plan, which also includes *The Greenest City Action Plan* (2012) and *The Vancouver Economic Actions Strategy* (2011). In response to *A Healthy City for All: Vancouver’s Healthy City Strategy* (2014), the City’s municipal social planning department (known today as the Social Policy Division) examined the potential social impacts of development in Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside in the *Downtown Eastside Social Impact Assessment: Draft Report – Spring 2014* (2014) (City of Vancouver, 2014). Due to the DTES’ close proximity to the downtown core and significantly lower land values, there had been increasing pressure to develop the DTES with new, high-income

households in a predominantly low-income community. This led to growing concerns of displacement from residents over the potential impacts of development in the neighbourhood (City of Vancouver, 2014). In response to these growing concerns, Vancouver City Council recommended a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) study be undertaken “in a parallel process” with the DTES Local Area Planning Program (LAPP). In accordance with Council and the *Downtown Eastside Social Impact Assessment (2014)*, the City and the Local Area Planning Program Committee created the *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan (2014)*. The main purpose of the *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan (2014)* was to create a tangible framework of programs, policies and plans as means to achieve the desired future of DTES residents. Also, to ensure market housing could proceed without displacing low-income residents or gentrifying the area, the plan is based on several conceptual approaches with various policies for the DTES. This new local area plan is hoped to help future long range planning and development become more integrated by enabling the development of strategic partnerships that continue to build upon efforts of past plans, policies, and programs (City of Vancouver, 2014). While greater attention was given to the DTES during the formulation of its local area plan, the City “worked very cross-departmentally” to focus on the entire city as a whole (Personal Communication, February 20, 2015).

In the Downtown Eastside, the social planning practices of the City of Vancouver are based on the preservation of existing assets and the aid and protection of vulnerable populations. The scope and scale of planning for the DTES LAP was larger than for the North End Plan, with participation of more than 10,000 people through different forms of public engagement (City of Vancouver, 2014). The SIA and LAPP processes took place concurrently and in collaboration from October 2011 to March 2013 (City of Vancouver, 2014). More than 600 residents,

representatives of vulnerable populations, and the DTES-LAPP Committee Reference Group shaped key themes and impact areas. The LAPP recognized existing City programs and initiatives, as well as new approaches, to carry out the plan. Also unique to this approach was the final part, or Action Plan, as it is considered the most crucial element of the DTES LAP (City of Vancouver, 2014). To holistically understand social planning practice by the City of Vancouver, it is important to acknowledge the City's inclusion of an Aboriginal Social Planner from 1999 to 2006. During this time, the City Manager recognized the growing needs of Indigenous people and decided to create a position within the Social Planning Department that could specifically focus on them (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015). This unique position centered on supporting Indigenous residents through grant provision and the design of creative projects "to reach the community in more creative ways" (Personal Communication, February 15, 2015).

Through the comparative analysis of these two research sites, there are many marked similarities and differences between the two models. First, in terms of similarities, each interviewee believes more could always be done. Second, both approaches believe every citizen is equally important. Third, both models believe more cross-departmental partnership and communication is required at this time of writing. Fourth, housing and homelessness remain major issues in both the DTES and North End. Fifth, both social planning models recognize the many underlying and interrelated issues causing and perpetuating poverty within their most disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Finally, both social planning models agree that vulnerable populations need better and more equal access to integrated services. Regarding differences between these two social planning models, first, the Winnipeg model believes City leadership is missing, but losing front-line leadership from grassroots organizations is also not ideal. Second, the City of Vancouver recognizes there has not been an adequate amount of consultation with

community members. Third, in Winnipeg it is clear that most grassroots and community organizations operate on different and unequal levels. Finally, the City of Vancouver is unprecedented and paramount in their formal recognition of their presence on Indigenous land.

In terms of policy, both community plans did a tremendous amount of background research and community profiling to gain a better understanding of the residents living in these neighbourhoods and local factors affecting them. Also, both community plans intend to preserve the historic and cultural diversity of North End and DTES neighbourhoods, as these unique characteristics have remained important parts of these communities for generations. At this time of writing, both community plans recognize and acknowledge the increasing safety concerns currently present within their neighbourhoods and have attempted to directly combat these issues through their planning techniques. While both community plans were able to identify specific outcomes and indicators of change, the City of Vancouver was able to go into much greater incremental detail than NECRC. However, the Province of Manitoba strengthened NECRC by recognizing the importance of strategic partnerships and grassroots neighbourhood revitalization through NA! programs. The SPCW and NECRC should be admired for their innovative and tenacious determination of going directly into North End neighbourhoods to get to know residents on a more personal, and sometimes first name, basis. The City of Vancouver must also be commemorated for their unique approach to planning within the DTES, through the announcement of a 'Year of Reconciliation' with Indigenous groups, announcement of being a 'City of Reconciliation' with Indigenous groups and the inclusion Aboriginal Place-Making within the DTES Local Area Plan.

6.2 Lessons from Winnipeg & Vancouver

It is evident both social planning models within Winnipeg and Vancouver fall short of the social planning ideal. Each approach offers lessons for the other, and this thesis argues in favour of an amalgamation of both models. These two social planning models have worked to support the particular needs and interests of residents living in Winnipeg's North End and Vancouver's Downtown Eastside in a number of ways. Through this research it is clear social planners, whether from the public or non-profit sectors, must strive to familiarize themselves with the people they wish to plan for. This personalization allows planners a sense of understanding and kinship with specific groups, and getting to know residents on a more personal basis ensures a sense of ownership for desired change. Furthermore, strategic partnerships were a common theme from both approaches. These types of relationships elicited the interdepartmental partnerships that so many organizations wish they had. Perhaps if more organizations were able to build these types of lasting relationships, whether with other organizations or with residents, levels of continued success would increase and desired outcomes would become the norm. Based on this research, it is clear Winnipeg has proven more successful in this type of relationship building and could offer much wisdom regarding this topic. Furthermore, a number of achievements and successes have occurred in each neighbourhood. Specifically, this research has uncovered a number of successful grant programs, initiatives and community programs that have proven successful. Perhaps this success could be attributed to the lasting relationships these programs and initiatives created with community members, similar to what is required for social planning organizations to prosper.

Throughout the analysis of each research site, these two social planning models have worked to promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes within

their most disadvantaged neighbourhoods. If counted, one could argue that the City of Vancouver has done more socially just and socially sustainable processes and outcomes, but this could be attributed to the larger scale and amount of resources they have. In this same sense, the City of Vancouver has also done more socially unjust and socially unsustainable processes and outcomes, most likely for these same reasons. This research maintains that both models have offered lessons to the social planning profession and should be recognized for that. However, the City of Vancouver must be celebrated for their continued work with Indigenous groups. From their formal recognition of being on Indigenous land, to their ultimate proclamation as a ‘City of Reconciliation’, other Canadian cities must look to Vancouver as an unprecedented benchmark for Indigenous rights and freedoms in Canada.

While both Winnipeg and Vancouver acknowledge the disproportionate number of Indigenous populations present within their most disadvantaged neighbourhoods, Winnipeg and the North End specifically have not implemented an adequate amount of supports for this population. As NECRC is based on economic neighbourhood renewal, it became clear through each interview that Indigenous residents were not the main focus of their work. Perhaps Winnipeg could look to Vancouver for lessons on how to more adequately support urban Indigenous groups. This research does not by any means believe the City of Vancouver has been perfect in their social planning approach, but their social planning techniques offer a starting place based in formal reconciliation and recognition with Indigenous peoples. The City of Vancouver’s inclusion of an Aboriginal Social Planner, while for a short period of time, must be recognized for its innovative and groundbreaking approach to planning within Vancouver. But why was support for this position discontinued? The ‘Aboriginal Place-Making’ section of the DTES Local Area Plan has also proved important but simply does not compare to having one

person specialize in the needs of this population. In this regard, the City of Vancouver could also learn from its past self. Thus, as anticipated, both social planning models could learn many lessons from each other.

6.3 Implications for Planning Practice

Since the 1960's, social planning has remained a contested subject. While the literature indicates a persistent inability to measure success, this research argues social planning is an important and integral component to Canadian planning practice. There is no other discipline that seeks to combine social issues with community planning in an attempt to improve quality of life. This research offers insight into how social planning creates lasting relationships, strategic partnerships and promotes a sense of ownership and responsibility to elicit desired change within a community. While each Canadian city operates its own unique approach to planning, and many Canadian cities do not have a municipal social planning department, this research has clearly demonstrated the importance of both social planning approaches in question. There is much to learn from a municipally-funded approach, just as there is much to learn from grassroots and non-profit organizations that operate in each city. Perhaps Federal, Provincial and local governments could recognize the value in both approaches and begin to implement a framework for social planning across Canadian cities. This framework could incorporate the proven successes of each approach and potentially begin to more adequately support the needs of Indigenous residents living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Specifically, the inclusion of an Indigenous Social Planner within each city would be a good starting point, and public engagement on more personal levels should be encouraged throughout any planning process. It is important to note how this framework does not imply a 'one-size-fits-all' approach to planning.

By recognizing each city and neighbourhood as unique, a thorough understanding of current social issues would be required prior to the implementation of the national framework. Thus, each city and/or neighbourhood would implement a more personalized version of the framework to increase the likelihood of desired change.

6.4 Potential for Future Research

While this research revealed many lessons for social planning practice, there were a number of areas that could have generated their own focuses of research. As NECRC is motivated by economic neighbourhood renewal, perhaps exploring the other non-profit organizations present in the North End would have offered a more holistic understanding of social planning in the area. Also, none of the non-profit or grassroots organizations within the DTES were included in this research and they could have offered greater insight into the conditions of social planning in the DTES. Future research should also include the exploration of social planning on a national level to better understand the approaches implemented across Canadian cities. Finally, an understanding of the success rates of each approach, program and initiative would be very valuable for social planning practice. Success, in and of itself, is a dynamic and multifaceted topic, and defining success could be a research project on its own. Furthermore, acknowledgment must be given to the countless ways of measuring success, i.e. ability to secure employment, complete post-secondary education, etc., and success can mean different things for different people. Thus, exploring the topic of success could be an incredibly valuable topic for future planning research.

6.5 Conclusion

Operating both within and outside municipal government, social planning organizations offer the potential to support systemically marginalized groups living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Unlike the City of Winnipeg, which features no municipal social planning department, the City of Vancouver attempts to support the Downtown Eastside through its municipal sector. To generate a better understanding of how these two social planning models have worked to support the particular needs and interests of residents currently living in these neighbourhoods, this research project compared the strengths and weaknesses of both social planning models in Winnipeg's North End and Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. Strengths and weaknesses were further analyzed using core concepts found in the literature regarding social justice and social sustainability. More specifically, this research project answered the question: how and to what degree have these two different models of social planning worked to promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes in these disadvantaged neighbourhoods?

Given the high proportion of Indigenous groups living in these neighbourhoods, greater awareness was given to understand how lessons could be applied to better support the growing number Indigenous residents living in these areas. Through the comparative case study of these two research sites, comprehensive document analysis, and semi-structured interviews with key informants from planning agencies in each city, current gaps in social planning literature have been filled and recommendations from both social planning models have been presented in an attempt to better support Canada's disadvantaged neighbourhoods with growing urban Indigenous populations. It is evident there are progressive and regressive characteristics of both social planning models within Winnipeg and Vancouver. Each approach offers lessons for the

other, and this thesis argues in favour of an amalgamation of both models. There is much to learn from a municipally-funded approach, just as there is much to learn from grassroots and non-profit organizations that operate in each city. Perhaps the Federal government could recognize the value in both approaches and begin to implement a framework for social planning in all Canadian cities. The inclusion of an Indigenous Social Planner within each city would be a good starting point, and public engagement on more personal levels should be encouraged throughout any planning process.

Throughout the analysis of each research site, these two social planning models have worked to promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes within their most disadvantaged neighbourhoods. This research maintains that both models have offered lessons to the social planning profession and should, therefore, be recognized for that. However, the City of Vancouver must be celebrated for their continued work with Indigenous groups. While both Winnipeg and Vancouver acknowledge the disproportionate number of urban Indigenous people residing within their most disadvantaged neighbourhoods, Winnipeg and the North End specifically have not implemented an adequate amount of supports for this population. The City of Vancouver's Aboriginal Social Planner was able to reach a demographic that may have been unreachable without their intervention. Likewise, the social planning and engagement techniques of the SPCW and NECRC created meaningful and lasting relationships with residents and, most importantly, were able to reach increasingly isolated groups. Thus, this research maintains that partnership with the more adequately-funded public sector could begin to better support those living in Canada's most disadvantaged neighbourhoods, particularly Canada's growing urban Indigenous population.

7.0 References

- Archibugi, F. (1996). Towards a New Discipline of Planning. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 30(2), 81-102.
- Auerbach, C., & Silverstein, L. (2003). *Qualitative Data: An Introduction to Coding and Analysis*. New York, NY: New York University Press (NYU Press).
- Bauwens, A. (2010). The use of method triangulation in probation research. *European Journal of Probation*, 2(2), 39-52.
- Buckland, J., & Martin, T. (2005). Fringe Banking in Winnipeg's North End. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Canadian Institute of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, & Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, (2010). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. Ottawa.
- Cardoso, R., & Breda-Vázquez, I. (2007). Social Justice as a Guide to Planning Theory and Practice: Analyzing the Portuguese Planning System. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 31(2), 384–400.
- City of Vancouver (2014). Retrieved September 20, 2014, from <http://vancouver.ca>
- City of Vancouver (2014). *A Healthy City for All: Vancouver's Healthy City Strategy 2014-2025 Phase 1*. Vancouver: Community Services - Social Policy Division. Retrieved from http://former.vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/cclerk/20141029/documents/ptec1_appendix_a_final.pdf
- City of Vancouver (2012). *Downtown Eastside Local Area Profile*. Vancouver: City of Vancouver Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan. Retrieved from <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/profile-dtes-local-area-2012.pdf>

- City of Vancouver (2014). *Downtown Eastside Local Area Plan: As adopted by City Council on March 15, 2014*. Vancouver: City of Vancouver. Retrieved from <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/downtown-eastside-plan.pdf>
- City of Vancouver (2014). *Downtown Eastside Social Impact Assessment: Draft Report – Spring 2014*. Vancouver: City of Vancouver: Community Services – Social Policy Division. Retrieved from: <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/social-impact-assessment-2014-feb-26.pdf>
- Davies, G., & Turner, F. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Canadian Social Work* (p. 372-373). Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier Press.
- Decrop, A. (1999). Triangulation in qualitative tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 20, 157-161.
- Dempsey, N., Bramley, G., Power, S., & Brown, C. (2011). The Social Dimension of Sustainable Development: Defining Urban Social Sustainability, (May 2009), 289–300.
- Dubey, S. (1979). Social Planning Process Steps and Considerations. *International Social Work*, 22(3), 3-10.
- Eisenschitz, A. (2008). Town Planning, Planning Theory and Social Reform. *International Planning Studies*, 13(2), 133-149.
- Fainstein, Susan S. (2010). *The Just City* [e-book]. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Accessed October 10, 2014.
- Fisher, L., & Marantz, N. (2015). Can state law combat exclusionary zoning? Evidence from Massachusetts. *Urban Studies*, 52(6), 1071-1089.
- Government of Manitoba (2000). *Manitoba Government News Release: Neighbourhoods Alive! Program Launched By Manitoba Government*. Winnipeg, MB: Information Services. Retrieved from: <http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/press/top/2000/06/2000-06-28-01.html>

- Government of Manitoba (2010). *Neighbourhoods Alive! Report to the Community: 120 Anniversary*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Housing and Community Development. Retrieved from http://www.gov.mb.ca/housing/neighbourhoods/na_bg/pdf/NAReportCommunity_web.pdf
- Harvey, David (1973). *Social Justice and the City* (Second Edition). Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (n.d.). Aboriginal Populations in Canadian Cities: Why are they growing so fast? Retrieved November 4, 2014, from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1352402108618/1352402154515>
- Institute of Urban Studies (2005). *Neighbourhoods Alive!: Community Outcomes Final Report*. Winnipeg, MB. Institute of Urban Studies: University of Winnipeg. Retrieved from http://www.gov.mb.ca/housing/neighbourhoods/na_bg/pdf/na_evaluation_2005.pdf
- Islam, D., Smith, D., Thompson, S., & Zurba, M. (2012). Food and healing: an urban community food security assessment for the North End of Winnipeg. *Urban Research & Practice*, 5(2), 284-289.
- Jurock - Vancouver Downtown Eastside, BC area information (2014). Retrieved November 30, 2015, from http://www2.jurock.com/areainfo/vancouver_vde.asp
- Leskiw & Associates, & North End Community Renewal Corporation (2011). *5 Year North End Community Plan and Renewal Plan (2011-2016)*. Winnipeg: North End Community Renewal Corporation. Retrieved from <http://necrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/5-Year-North-End-Community-and-Renewal-Plan-FINAL.pdf>
- Machiavelli, N. (1978). Planning in an Abstract City, *Geographical Analysis*, 10(4), 373–385.
- Malabar, M., Grant, K. (2010). *North End Assessment Report Winnipeg: Food Matters Manitoba*. Retrieved from

<http://foodmattersmanitoba.ca/sites/default/files/Winnipeg%20North%20End%20FINAL%20ASSESSMENT%20REPORT%20-%20April%2030>

Morgan, J. (1975). Social Planning ~ the Intractable Issues. *International Social Work*, 18(12), 12-18.

Morris, R. (1969). Theory and Practice of Social Planning by Alfred J. Kahn; Studies in Social Policy and Planning by Alfred J. Kahn. *Social Service Review*, 43(3), 366-370.

Mushkat, M. (1985). The "Supply Side" of Social Planning. *International Social Work*, 28(22), 22-34.

Newnham, J. (2005). An Overview of Vancouver's Downtown Eastside for UBC Learning Exchange Trek Program Participants. UBC Learning Exchange. Retrieved November 30, 2015 from <http://www.learningexchange.ubc.ca/files/2010/11/overviewdtes2016.pdf>

Peralta, T. (2007). Neighbourhoods Alive!: Multi-Pronged Initiative for Community Based Neighbourhood Revitalization. *Taking the Pulse of Practice: Manitoba Practicing Planner - Case In Point 2007*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba. Retrieved from https://umanitoba.ca/faculties/architecture/media/CiP_2007_Tammi_Peralta.pdf

Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. (2013). *Social Planning Council of Winnipeg*. Retrieved from <http://www.spcw.mb.ca>

Smith, H.A. (2003). Planning, policy and polarisation in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 94(4), 496-509.

Statistics Canada (2010). *2006 Aboriginal Population Profile for Winnipeg*. Ottawa: Social and Aboriginal Statistics Division. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-638-x/2010003/article/11082-eng.pdf>

- Statistics Canada (2011). *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: First Nations People, Métis and Inuit: National Household Survey 2011*. Ottawa: Social and Aboriginal Statistics Division Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/99-011-x2011001-eng.pdf>
- Thomas, J. (2006). Teaching Planning History as a Path to Social Justice. *Journal of Planning History*, 5(4), 314-322.
- Thompson, A. (1980). Cultural Values and Social Planning: A Control Theory Approach to Satisfying a Social Welfare Criterion. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.*, 39(2), 199-208.
- Tourism Winnipeg (2015). *North End*. Retrieved November 30, 2015, from <http://www.tourismwinnipeg.com/plan/neighbourhoods/display,neighbourhood/11/north-end>
- United Way. (2010). *Eagle's Eye View: An Environmental Scan of the Indigenous Community in Winnipeg* (Second Edition). Retrieved from website: <http://www.unitedwaywinnipeg.mb.ca/pdf/unitedway-eagleseyeview-10.pdf>
- Vallance, S., Perkins, H. C., & Dixon, J. E. (2011). What is social sustainability? A clarification of concepts. *Geoforum*, 42(3), 342–348.
- Westhues, A. (1980). Stages in Social Planning. *Social Service Review*, 54(3), 331-343. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30015841>
- Winkler, T. (2012). Between economic efficacy and social justice: Exposing the ethico-politics of planning. *Cities*, 29(3), 166–173.
- Wood, E. (1964). Social-Welfare Planning. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 352, 119-128.

- Wolfe, J. (2004). *Our Common Past: An Interpretation of Canadian Planning History*. Retrieved from Canadian Institute of Planners website: http://www.cip-icu.ca/CMS/Files/JeanneWolfe_75article.pdf
- Xu, L., Clark, A., Cook, A., Casselman, J., Strong, Gregorio, R., Lebaron, K., Snyder, K., & Nilsen, E. (2001). *University of Manitoba Aboriginal Planning Program: A Proposal*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: University of Manitoba. Retrieved from: <http://www.umanitoba.ca/architecture/cp/app/documents/APPproposal.pdf>
- Yin, R. (2014). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (Fifth Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendices

A Ethics approval letter



**Research Ethics
and Compliance**

Office of the Vice-President (Research and International)

Human Ethics
208-194 Dafoe Road
Winnipeg, MB
Canada R3T 2N2
Phone +204-474-7122
Fax +204-269-7173

APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

January 16, 2015

TO:

FROM:

Re:

Protocol #J2014:164
"Social planning for disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Canada:
comparative case study of Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg's
North End"

Please be advised that your above-referenced protocol has received human ethics approval by the **Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board**, which is organized and operates according to the Tri-Council Policy Statement (2). **This approval is valid for one year only.**

Any significant changes of the protocol and/or informed consent form should be reported to the Human Ethics Secretariat in advance of implementation of such changes.

Please note:

- If you have funds pending human ethics approval, please mail/e-mail/fax (261-0325) a copy of this Approval (identifying the related UM Project Number) to the Research Grants Officer in ORS in order to initiate fund setup. (How to find your UM Project Number: <http://umanitoba.ca/research/ors/mrt-faq.html#pr0>)
- if you have received multi-year funding for this research, responsibility lies with you to apply for and obtain Renewal Approval at the expiry of the initial one-year approval; otherwise the account will be locked.

The Research Quality Management Office may request to review research documentation from this project to demonstrate compliance with this approved protocol and the University of Manitoba *Ethics of Research Involving Humans*.

The Research Ethics Board requests a final report for your study (available at: http://umanitoba.ca/research/orec/ethics/human_ethics_REB_forms_guidelines.html) **in order to be in compliance with Tri-Council Guidelines.**

umanitoba.ca/research

B Project Backgrounder



UNIVERSITY
OF MANITOBA

City Planning
201 Russell Building
84 Curry Place
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2
Tel: (204) 474-9458
Fax: (204) 474-7532

Faculty of Architecture

Project Backgrounder for prospective study participants

As a potential study participant, the following information is intended to provide you with background information on my Master's Major Degree Project in the Department of City Planning, at the University of Manitoba. This research is being supervised by [REDACTED] the Department of City Planning.

The purpose of this Major Degree Project is to explore the value of social planning departments in the public and private sectors, to better understand what is required to support disadvantaged neighbourhoods like Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg's North End. Unlike the City of Winnipeg, which features no municipal social planning department, the City of Vancouver supports the Downtown Eastside through its municipal sector. At this time, Winnipeg has demonstrated a clear need for the coordination of services and more adequate funding for social planning. By looking at social planning models in Winnipeg's North End and the City of Vancouver's Downtown Eastside, this project intends to explore the opportunities and challenges of each model, fill current research gaps identified in the existing literature, and ultimately provide a set of recommendations for how to more adequately support disadvantaged neighbourhoods. It is hoped this exploration will generate a better understanding of how these two social planning models have worked to support the particular needs and interests of residents living in these neighbourhoods. More specifically, this research project asks: how and to what degree these two different models of social planning have worked to promote socially just and socially sustainable planning processes and outcomes in these disadvantaged neighbourhoods?

There are no direct benefits of taking part in the study however it does provide participant with a platform to share their valuable insights that may help researchers better understand the value of social planning in disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

C Consent Form



UNIVERSITY
OF MANITOBA

City Planning
201 Russell Building
84 Curry Place
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2
Tel: (204) 474-9458
Fax: (204) 474-7532

Faculty of Architecture

Statement of Informed Consent

- Research Project Study: *'Social planning for disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Canada: Comparative case study of Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg's North End'*
- Principal Investigator: [REDACTED], Graduate Student, Master of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba
- Advisory Committee:
- Supervisor** – [REDACTED], Professor, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba
 - Internal Advisor** – [REDACTED], Professor, Department of City Planning, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba
 - External Advisor** – [REDACTED], Professor, Department of Native Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Manitoba

Introduction

You are invited to take part in a research study. This consent form, a copy of which you can keep for your records, is intended to ensure you have consented willingly and with all necessary information. It should explain what is involved in the research and what is expected of you as a participant.

Please take time to read, understand, and review the consent form and information about the research. If you would like more information please feel free to ask me (the Principal Investigator).

Purpose of the study

The proposed research explores the value of social planning departments in the public and private sectors, to better understand what is required to support disadvantaged neighbourhoods like Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and Winnipeg's North End.

The proposed research project will explore the history of social planning in Canada, while comparing the strengths and weaknesses of both social planning models in Winnipeg's North End and Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. It is hoped this exploration will generate a better understanding of how these two social planning models have worked to support the particular needs and interests of residents living in these neighbourhoods. Through the critical investigation and assessment of both social planning models in Winnipeg's North End and the City of Vancouver's Downtown Eastside, this project intends to explore the opportunities and challenges of each model, fill current research gaps identified in the existing literature, and ultimately provide a set of recommendations for how to more adequately support disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Each participant will be asked to participate in one phone interview to further discuss their experiences with social planning in these neighbourhoods.

This research project is my Major Degree Project, a requirement of the two-year Master of City Planning program at the University of Manitoba.

Study procedures

If you participate in this study you will be asked to participate in one semi-structured interview with the Principal Investigator. You will be asked to talk about your experiences regarding social planning in these disadvantaged neighbourhoods. In total, this research project will take up approximately 45 minutes of your time.

Participant risks, benefits, costs

There are minimal risks related to taking part in this project. As you will be identifiable based on your job title, you may be concerned with being critical of funders or supervisors, etc. Please remember that your responses will be used to improve existing conditions of disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Canada and you will be given the opportunity to review your transcript to make sure your comments are appropriate for the public domain.

Interviews can take place at your earliest convenience, and will only include you and the Principal Investigator.

There are no direct benefits of taking part in the study, however participation does provide you with a platform to share your valuable insights, that may help future researchers better understand social planning in disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

Audiotaping & confidentiality

With your permission, the interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed at a later time to ensure accuracy. Your name will not be included in this study; however, in order to adequately convey your expertise and knowledge, you will be identified by your job title. Given the size of your organization, it is possible someone could identify you based on this description or job title. Job titles do need to be included in this study, as the reader needs to be provided with some sense of your unique position and insights into the day-to-day work of your social planning agency.

Data will be stored in a secure location on a locked computer and I (the Principal Investigator) will destroy all identifying information, including audio tapings and interview transcripts six months after the final submission of this Major Degree Project.

Feedback & debriefing

Once the interview is done, I will provide you with an interview transcript giving you the opportunity to verify the information and remove or modify any comments that you now feel are inappropriate for the public domain. I will provide individual feedback to you within two months of the interview through phone, email, or in person to ensure the information I have compiled from the interviews is accurate. Once the Major Project Degree has been completed I will provide you with a digital copy.

Dissemination of results

Study results will be disseminated through my Master of City Planning Major Degree Project, a hard copy held at the Architecture/Fine Arts library at the University of Manitoba, a digital copy online through University of Manitoba's M Space, and my oral defense. You will also be offered a digital copy of the Major Degree Project via email, once the Masters' Defense has been approved.

Voluntary participation/Withdrawal from study

Your decision to take part in this study is entirely voluntary. You are able to refuse participation or to withdraw from the research study at any time. If you decide to participate you have the right to refuse to answer any question or to refuse participation in any activity, at any time.

Contact information

Student researcher

██████████ Graduate Student, Department of City Planning, Faculty of
Architecture, University of Manitoba
Phone: ██████████
Email: ██████████

Research supervisor

██████████, Professor, Department of City Planning, Faculty of
Architecture, University of Manitoba
Phone: ██████████
Email: ██████████

Statement of consent

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial

consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board (JFREB) If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Coordinator (HEC) at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

I have read this consent form. I have had the opportunity to discuss this research study with the student researcher. I have had my questions answered by her in language that I understand. I understand that I will be given a copy of this consent form after signing it. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may choose to withdraw at any time. I freely agree to participate in this research study.

I understand that the information I provide will be incorporated in a presentation and report by the Principal Investigator. I also understand that all information will be treated as confidential, stored in a private and secure place, and destroyed two years after the end of the project by the student researcher.

Consent for audiotaping the interviews

I consent to having the interview audiotaped and transcribed

I do not consent to having the interview audiotaped and transcribed

Participant Printed Name

Participant Signature

Date

D Interview Questions

1. Could you tell me about your position within your (*department / agency / council*) and explain some key duties and responsibilities you and your (*department / agency / council*) have/had?
2. Could you tell me about the types of planning related work your agency has been involved in?
 - a. Could you give me some examples of how your agency has worked to support residents of some of your city's most disadvantaged neighbourhoods like the (*Downtown Eastside / North End*)?
 - b. Have you worked with Indigenous residents in these neighbourhoods? If yes, how so?
3. Could you talk about some of the values or goals that underlay your work in disadvantaged neighbourhoods?
4. Could you talk through one of the projects you are most proud of in the (*Downtown Eastside / North End*)?
 - a. What planning processes did you use in these situations?
 - b. How were residents involved?
 - c. What were some of the outcomes of these projects?
5. Do you feel more could have been done? If yes, how so? What was missing?
6. What do you think is necessary to more adequately support disadvantaged neighbourhoods like the (*Downtown Eastside / North End*)?
7. Is there anything else you would like to tell me?