RESEARCH REPORT

Social Inclusion and Urban Form: An Exploratory Research Study

Canada

CMHC SCHL
HOME TO CANADIANS

CMHC—HOME TO CANADIANS

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has been Canada's national housing agency for more than 60 years.

Together with other housing stakeholders, we help ensure that Canada maintains one of the best housing systems in the world. We are committed to helping Canadians access a wide choice of quality, affordable homes, while making vibrant, healthy communities and cities a reality across the country.

For more information, visit our website at **www.cmhc.ca**

You can also reach us by phone at 1-800-668-2642 or by fax at 1-800-245-9274.

Outside Canada call 613-748-2003 or fax to 613-748-2016.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation supports the Government of Canada policy on access to information for people with disabilities. If you wish to obtain this publication in alternative formats, call 1-800-668-2642.

Final report

Social inclusion and urban form:

An exploratory research study

Prepared for Denis Losier, CMHC
By Margaret Eberle and Luba Serge
January 12, 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to gratefully acknowledge the contribution of the individuals who participated in this project as key informants and panel discussion members.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Social inclusion has become a topic of growing interest among makers of social policy and researchers. In response, CMHC commissioned research to explore the role that a city's physical attributes, such as the pattern of streets, land use, open spaces, or transportation connections to other neighbourhoods, play in a community's social development. Housing, given its role in the urban landscape, is a major factor for consideration.

This research project explored the link between urban form and social inclusion in a Canadian context. The aim of the study was to review existing research about the impact of urban form and social inclusion; to identify emerging thinking; discover what other research is being done and identify research gaps.

METHODOLOGY

The three-part research strategy consisted of a literature review, interviews with key Canadian informants and a panel discussion. All three approaches tried to answer questions such as:

- What is commonly understood by the term "social inclusion"?
- What are the interactions between urban design and social inclusion and what factors affect them?
- What qualities of physical neighbourhood/community environment and features lead to higher degrees of social inclusion and well-being, and vice versa?
- Are there individual characteristics of community design that play a greater role in contributing to the well-being of the inhabitants, such as parks, public space, mix of housing, other land use and so on?
- What can be learned from existing research about urban form and social integration? What are the main gaps that should be researched? Do those gaps involve quantitative or qualitative research?
- What indicators exist to measure the different dimensions of the relationship between the physical and the social aspects of a neighbourhood or a community?

Literature review

The literature review includes published research using the concept of social inclusion/exclusion. This is rare in the American literature. For this reason, few American works are included.

However, social inclusion is rooted in much older and larger concepts and can encompass notions such as social mix and social cohesion, which are explained in Section 2 of the report. Furthermore, if the concept of social inclusion is combined with urban form, the literature on spatial segregation and social sustainability is pertinent.

This review has not resolved these issues, but also has not expanded the review to encompass these concepts, unless they are directly related to works or analyses of social inclusion/exclusion.

Key informant interviews

This part of the research consisted of interviews with 15 key Canadian informants to obtain their thoughts on some of the basic questions that formed the foundation of the study. Key informants included academics who have written or worked on issues of social inclusion; municipal housing and planning staff in three major urban centres; representatives of urban, architectural and planning organizations; and, social researchers.

Topics included the concept of social inclusion, the composition of the excluded, the physical attributes of an inclusive environment and examples of inclusive neighbourhoods.

These interviews also sought to identify grey literature[1] and related research that is ongoing.

Panel discussion

Six people participated in a teleconference on May 9, 2006. In advance, panellists received a brief discussion paper highlighting some of the key points from the literature review and key informant interviews.

The aim of the panel discussion was to delve more deeply into some of the important questions pertaining to the links between social inclusion and urban form, and to build upon the knowledge gleaned from the literature and key informant interviews.

FINDINGS

"Social inclusion" and "urban form," the two terms at the heart of the study, were both amorphous and needed defining at the outset. Social inclusion proved to be much more elusive in the literature, in the interviews with key informants and in the panel discussion. As this study has revealed, the term social inclusion can refer to spatial distribution of different characteristics—economic, social, and cultural—as well as the allocation of services, accessibility and process.

Definitions

Both the literature and the discussions underline that "inclusion" as such cannot be conceived without the opposing "exclusion" because they are "inextricably intertwined" as Guildford (2000) proposes, As well, because an "in" is being delineated, "if you have inclusion you will always have exclusion" as the panel discussion revealed. If social

[1] "Grey literature" comprises scientific and technical reports, patent documents, conference papers, internal reports, government documents, newsletters, fact sheets and theses, which are not readily available through commercial channels.

exclusion is the process that denies people access, participation and choice, then social inclusion can be interpreted as being value-laden and normative, incorporating social justice, diversity that is valued; opportunities for choice; entitlement to rights and services; working together (Cushing 2003).

The panel discussion on the concept or idea of social inclusion also was divided about the utility of the term, but it was agreed that while social inclusion may not be universally seen as useful, there was agreement that the adjunct idea of social justice was. The definition that was proposed for this study is:

> …the situation in which individuals and communities (both physical and demographic) are fully involved in the society in which they reside/occur/exist, including the economic, social, cultural and political dimensions of that society.

As for urban form, Lynch's (1989) definition of "settlement form" was adopted in this study since it addresses both physical form, as well as the control of space:

> …settlement form is the spatial arrangement of persons doing things, the resulting spatial flows of persons, goods and information, and the physical features which modify space in some way significant to those actions, including enclosures, surfaces, channels, ambiences, and objects. Further, the description must include the cyclical and secular changes in those spatial distributions, the control of space and the perception of it. The last two, of course, are raids into the domains of social institutions and of mental life.

Expression within urban form

Even if there appears to be consensus that social inclusion is desirable, the knowledge of what this means in practice is less evident. There is little specific guidance that is available and accessible to practitioners, particularly at the municipal level where most land-use decisions are made.

Panellists agreed that there is a link between social inclusion/exclusion and urban form. The design and form of our cities, at both the micro (site planning) and macro (metropolitan) level, can facilitate inclusion or exclusion or at the very least, serve to maintain it. Neighbourhoods in particular are a focus of concern. Neighbourhood effects, or the social interactions that occur close to one's residence that affect social and economic well-being, are the potential vehicle for inclusion/exclusion

The panel discussion focused on the extent or strength of the relationship: there is "clearly a relationship between built form… [and social inclusion] at all scales. It's not deterministic, but powerful."[2] Panellists felt that the goal of urban form should be to create inclusion in natural ways, with the recognition that form can facilitate/promote inclusion, but can not create it.

Land-use mix, public transportation, public space and social mix were the aspects of urban form that received the most attention in the Canadian literature and among the panellists, as relating to social inclusion. Urban form at all scales—the individual site, neighbourhood, city and region—plays a role in social inclusion. Scale, however, was

[2] Panel discussion. May 9, 2006.

found to mediate the nature and extent of the link between different aspects of urban form.

Mixed land use

Related to the idea of "porosity"[3] and breaking down barriers in enclosed neighbourhoods is the mix of land uses. The panellists concluded that land-use mix is one of the central elements of urban form that can promote an inclusive environment. Current zoning practices, which tend to separate uses, are partially responsible for maintaining social exclusion. Numerous key informants referred to the work of Jane Jacobs and her emphasis on the importance of mixed uses in promoting socially vital neighbourhoods and the impact not only on exchange and engagement but also on security and safety with a 24-hour city, that is, a city that lives around the clock.

Public space

Tied to mixed uses is the importance of public spaces and central area or core area–downtown spaces. They are seen as an especially important component of urban form, its civic life, and the identity of the whole city. Public space, in the sense of a widely shared public core, plays a central role in the limited urban discourse about social inclusion. Such public spaces are settings that bring people with differing backgrounds together for civic celebrations or to act as the symbolic centre of a city.

Transportation

Transportation helps to promote accessibility within the city and counteract undesirable isolation of certain groups. It is a key element in porosity, and the presence or adequacy of public transit is seen as key to maintaining access and inclusion for those without the resources to use automobile-based transportation.

For the most part, the Canadian experience of inadequate public transit, to the now fast-growing suburban municipalities that are also home to lower-income residents, acts to maintain exclusion of these groups. Lack of porosity is also seen in early public housing projects where buildings were set in "park-like" settings with no through roads.

Social mix

Social mix appears to be essential at the city and metropolitan level, however, many of the successes have been achieved at the neighbourhood level with social housing programs. At the same time, the political and planning process that controls these decisions must be accessible and meaningful for a diversity of groups. The study reveals that while examples of exclusion are readily available, it is much harder to find examples of inclusionary practice.

Attention to pedestrian orientation and physical safety were cited as characteristics of "inclusive" neighbourhoods. But the most common example of social inclusion are neighbourhoods or projects that have or tried to have a "social mix"—a mix of household

[3] The idea of porosity was mentioned by key informants and during the panel discussion. It includes access and openness, which are important.

types and income. Some key informants suggested social mix as a synonym for “social inclusion.” This type of social mix is a strong thread in policy and programs in Canada, as elsewhere.

To counter the natural effect of the market, achieving social mix has typically required the use of federal, provincial and municipal policies and programs both in new and existing neighbourhoods.

Process

Panellists focused on process as well, suggesting that one way to promote social inclusion is through planning and negotiation that facilitates social transaction between people at any scale. This suggests that planned landscapes that don’t work suffer from not enough diversity at the planning stage. However, it is recognized that public process is not easy or inexpensive, and can also marginalize population groups that do not or can not participate.

CONCLUSION

While the underlying goals of social inclusion are not new, the utility of the term may be its ability to re-examine issues of inequality, uneven access to resources and the impact of this.

In Canada, the idea of social inclusion may offer the potential to re-energize old debates, particularly in the context of the increasing diversity of our large metropolitan areas. It has been suggested that the idea of social inclusion sets higher expectations for change and reaches for more ambitious indicators. Combined with urban form, it further focuses on cities and their importance economically, politically, socially and culturally. It also highlights awareness of the importance of place and interest in the role of neighbourhoods.

The ability of cities to make room for the diversity, as illustrated by the process of establishing mosques in Toronto, or wider recognition of the contribution of immigrants, as illustrated by the East London work with the Bangladeshi community, may present one of the greatest challenges confronting urban places.

FURTHER RESEARCH

There are still knowledge gaps on the links between social inclusion and urban form and this study brought forward potential research projects that could address these gaps.

Excluded groups

A fundamental question in the context of any future research on the impact of urban form and social inclusion in a Canadian context is the issue of who is excluded.

This is especially important given the dynamic nature of our cities, and the fact that they are home to a large and growing concentration of immigrants. While many would agree that the homeless, immigrants and people of Aboriginal origin represent some of the most-excluded in our society, a related investigation might look at whether there are individuals or groups who experience exclusion that we do not normally think of as being excluded. For example:

- Might way of life be the distinguishing characteristic, as opposed to tenure or class?

Social mix

There was much debate in the published and grey literature, key informant interviews and among the panellists about the social mix concept, the appropriate scale, its role and effectiveness in promoting social inclusion and how to achieve it.

There also seems to be confusion around the terms social mix and social inclusion, with some tending to use the terms interchangeably. At the very least, social mix is viewed as a component of social inclusion. This would seem to be a central issue for Canadian housing policy-makers and planners, where the notion has been adopted and used for years, specifically in the context of social housing projects. Specific research questions might be:

- What do we hope to achieve with social mix?
- What is a desirable social mix, given the ever-changing diversity of our cities?

Spatial policies for social inclusion

It was difficult for key informants and panellists to identify key physical attributes of an inclusive community and there is little literature in this area. It was much simpler to recognize the barriers inherent in an exclusive community.

The literature demonstrates a similar emphasis on physical manifestations of exclusion, although there is some evidence of the positive role of social mix, mixed land uses, public space and transportation. These are generally the purview of local planners and politicians. Both the dearth of published literature and the panel discussion point to a lack of clear direction regarding those urban forms and the elements of urban form that promote inclusion.

While mixed land use, access to public transportation, downtown public space and social mix were felt to be important, clear guidelines as to what these should look like or how they should perform are lacking. The idea of porosity was mentioned by key informants and during the panel discussion. If, in fact, small-scale social mix is not critical, but porosity, which includes access and openness, is, then it could be important to understand how porosity can be encouraged. Questions could include:

- What is a desirable mix of land uses?
- What are the best approaches for achieving it?
- At what scale?

These researches, along with what was previously and currently being done, could produce and provide some data or indicators linking the social and physical aspects of a community. In return, this information could help better understand the definition, the process and the development of social inclusion within the urban form, which would bring a potential to improve the lives of many citizens within every community.

RÉSUMÉ

INTRODUCTION

L'inclusion sociale devient un sujet d'intérêt de plus en plus marqué chez les responsables des politiques sociales et les chercheurs sociaux. C'est pourquoi la SCHL a commandé une recherche sur l'influence des caractéristiques physiques d'une ville, comme le tracé des rues, l'utilisation des terrains, les espaces ouverts ou les modes de transport reliant d'autres quartiers, sur le développement social d'une collectivité. Le logement, en raison de son rôle dans l'aménagement urbain, constitue un important facteur dont il faut tenir compte.

Ce projet de recherche étudie le lien qui existe entre la forme urbaine et l'inclusion sociale, dans le contexte canadien. L'étude vise à examiner les résultats des recherches qui ont été effectuées sur les incidences de la forme urbaine et de l'inclusion sociale, à cerner les pensées émergentes, à vérifier les autres recherches en cours et à relever les lacunes dans les recherches.

MÉTHODOLOGIE

La stratégie de recherche en trois parties comportait le dépouillement d'ouvrages spécialisés, la tenue d'entrevues avec des intervenants canadiens clés et l'organisation d'une discussion entre spécialistes. Ces trois méthodes d'approche visaient à répondre à certaines questions, comme :

- Qu'est-ce qu'on entend par « inclusion sociale » ?
- Quelles sont les interactions de l'urbanisme et de l'inclusion sociale, et quels sont les facteurs qui les influencent?
- Quelles sont les qualités et les caractéristiques d'un quartier ou d'une collectivité qui favorisent des niveaux élevés d'inclusion sociale, et vice-versa?
- Existent-ils des caractéristiques particulières dans l'aménagement de collectivités qui contribuent grandement au bien-être des habitants, comme les parcs, les espaces publics, différents types d'habitations, une utilisation variée des terrains, et ainsi de suite?
- Que peut-on dégager des recherches existantes sur la forme urbaine et l'intégration sociale? Quelles sont les principales lacunes à examiner? Faut-il entreprendre des recherches quantitatives ou qualitatives pour les combler?
- Existent-ils des indicateurs permettant de mesurer à divers degrés la relation qui existe entre les caractéristiques physiques et sociales d'un quartier ou d'une collectivité?

Dépouillement d'ouvrages spécialisés

Le dépouillement d'ouvrages spécialisés a porté, entre autres, sur les recherches publiées où la notion d'inclusion ou d'exclusion sociale est utilisée, ce qui est rare dans

la littérature américaine. C'est pourquoi, nous retrouvons peu d'ouvrages américains dans le dépouillement.

Toutefois, l'inclusion sociale est axée sur des concepts beaucoup plus anciens et larges, et peut englober des notions comme la mixité sociale et la cohésion sociale, lesquelles sont expliquées dans la deuxième section du rapport. De plus, si on combine les deux notions d'inclusion sociale et de forme urbaine, les ouvrages sur la ségrégation spatiale et la durabilité sociale deviennent alors pertinents. Ce dépouillement n'a pas résolu ces enjeux, mais n'a pas non plus été élargi afin d'englober ces concepts, à moins qu'ils ne traitaient directement de travaux ou d'analyses portant sur l'inclusion ou l'exclusion sociale.

Entrevues avec des intervenants clés

Des entrevues avec 15 intervenants canadiens clés ont été tenues afin de sonder leur opinion sur certaines questions fondamentales qui forment la base de l'étude. Ces intervenants comprenaient des universitaires ayant rédigé des ouvrages ou travaillé sur le concept de l'inclusion sociale; des employés municipaux responsables du logement et de l'urbanisme dans trois importants centres urbains; des représentants de sociétés d'architecture, d'urbanisme et d'aménagement; et des chercheurs sociaux.

Les sujets abordés comprenaient la notion d'inclusion sociale, la composition des groupes exclus, les caractéristiques physiques d'un environnement inclusif et des exemples de quartiers inclusifs.

Les entrevues visaient également à recenser la littérature grise[4] et les recherches connexes en cours.

Discussions entre spécialistes

Le 9 mai 2006, six personnes ont participé à une conférence téléphonique. Ils avaient reçu à l'avance un court document de travail montrant certains des principaux points dégagés au cours de l'examen des ouvrages spécialisés et des entrevues avec les intervenants clés.

Les discussions visaient à approfondir certaines des questions importantes concernant les liens qui existent entre l'inclusion sociale et la forme urbaine, et à s'appuyer sur les connaissances tirées des ouvrages spécialisés et des entrevues avec les intervenants clés.

RÉSULTATS

Les deux notions qui étaient au coeur de l'étude, soit « l'inclusion sociale » et « la forme urbaine » étaient toutes les deux imprécises et devaient être définies au départ. Le concept de « l'inclusion sociale » s'est avéré beaucoup plus difficile à saisir dans les

[4] La littérature grise comprend des rapports scientifiques et techniques, des documents de brevet, des documents de conférence, des rapports internes, des documents gouvernementaux, des bulletins, des feuillets d'information et des thèses, que l'on ne peut obtenir facilement sur le marché.

ouvrages spécialisés et au cours des entrevues avec les intervenants clés et des discussions entre spécialistes. Comme le révèle cette étude, l'inclusion sociale peut invoquer la distribution spatiale de différentes caractéristiques—économiques, sociales et culturelles—ainsi que la répartition des services, l'accessibilité et le processus.

Définitions

D'après les ouvrages spécialisés et les discussions, il ressort qu'il est impossible de se faire une idée du concept de l'inclusion sans aborder son contraire, l'exclusion, car les deux concepts sont inextricablement liés, comme l'indique Guildford (2000). De même, au cours des discussions, les spécialistes ont indiqué qu'on ne peut parler d'inclusion sans parler d'exclusion. Si l'exclusion sociale est le processus par lequel l'accès, la participation et le choix sont refusés à des personnes, alors on peut supposer que l'inclusion sociale revêt une grande importance et est un concept normatif qui valorise la justice sociale et la diversité, offre la possibilité de choisir, donne accès à des droits et des services et favorise la collaboration (Cushing 2003).

Au cours des discussions sur le concept ou la notion de l'inclusion sociale, les spécialistes étaient également divisés quant à son utilité, mais ils avaient convenu que bien que son utilité ne soit pas universellement reconnue, celle du concept sous-jacent de justice sociale l'était. Voici la définition qui a été proposée pour cette étude :

> …une situation où des personnes ou des collectivités (tant du point de vue physique que démographique) sont des participants à part entière dans la société où elles résident, interviennent, existent, notamment aux niveaux économique, social, culturel et politique de celle-ci.

Quant à la notion de « forme urbaine », on a repris la définition de « forme d'aménagement » donnée par Lynch (1989), car elle traite tant de la forme physique que du contrôle de l'espace :

> …la disposition dans l'espace de personnes actives, le mouvement dans l'espace de ces personnes, des produits et de l'information qui en résultent, et les caractéristiques physiques qui modifient l'espace de façon notable en fonction de ces actions, notamment les enceintes, les surfaces, les voies, les ambiances et les objets. De plus, la description doit tenir compte des changements cycliques et séculaires dans ces distributions spatiales ainsi que du contrôle de l'espace et de sa perception. Évidemment, les deux derniers éléments relèvent des domaines des institutions sociales et de la vie mentale.

L'inclusion sociale dans la forme urbaine

Même si on semble convenir que l'inclusion sociale est préférable, en pratique nos connaissances de la signification de ce concept sont moins évidentes. Les praticiens ont un accès limité à des lignes directrices, en particulier à l'échelle de la municipalité où la majorité des décisions sur l'utilisation des terrains sont prises.

Les spécialistes conviennent qu'il existe un lien entre l'inclusion ou l'exclusion sociale et la forme urbaine. L'aménagement et la forme de nos villes, tant à petite échelle (aménagement des terrains) qu'à grande échelle (métropole), peuvent favoriser l'inclusion ou l'exclusion ou, du moins, servir à les maintenir. Les quartiers, en

particulier, sont une source de préoccupations, car leurs incidences ou la proximité des interactions sociales qu'on y retrouve et qui influent sur le bien-être socio-économique des gens, peuvent engendrer différents types d'inclusion ou d'exclusion.

Les spécialistes ont surtout abordé l'étendue ou l'importance de la relation : il ressort « clairement qu'il y a une relation entre la forme existante…[et l'inclusion sociale] à toutes les échelles. Cette relation n'est pas déterministe, mais elle est néanmoins puissante ».[5] Selon les spécialistes, la forme urbaine devrait avoir comme objectif de créer de façon naturelle l'inclusion, tout en reconnaissant toutefois qu'elle peut la favoriser ou la promouvoir, mais ne peut la créer.

Les aspects de la forme urbaine abordés dans les ouvrages canadiens spécialisés et au cours des discussions sur l'inclusion sociale sont surtout l'utilisation des terrains, le transport en commun, les espaces publics et la mixité sociale. La forme urbaine à toutes les échelles—un emplacement, le quartier, la ville et la région—joue un rôle dans l'inclusion sociale. Toutefois, on constate que les décisions prises à chacun de ces niveaux influent sur la nature et l'étendue du lien qui existe entre les divers aspects de la forme urbaine.

Utilisation des terrains

L'utilisation variée des terrains fait penser à la notion de « porosité »[6] et d'élimination des barrières dans les quartiers fermés. Les spécialistes ont conclu qu'une utilisation variée des terrains est l'un des aspects essentiels de la forme urbaine pouvant favoriser un environnement inclusif. Les méthodes de zonage actuelles, qui tendent à séparer les utilisations, sont en partie responsables du maintien de l'exclusion sociale. Nombre d'intervenants clés ont mentionné les travaux de Jane Jacobs et l'accent qu'elle met sur l'importance de varier l'utilisation des terrains afin de favoriser l'aménagement de quartiers socialement dynamiques et sur l'impact de cette approche non seulement sur les échanges et les engagements, mais aussi sur la sécurité dans une ville qui ne dort jamais.

Espaces publics

Dans l'utilisation variée des terrains, il est important de tenir compte des espaces publics et des aires centrales ou centres-villes. Les spécialistes estiment que ces emplacements représentent un élément essentiel de la forme urbaine, de la vie urbaine et de l'identité de toute la ville. Les espaces publics, soit des aires centrales accessibles à tout le public, occupent une place essentielle dans les discours limités que l'on tient à l'échelle des villes sur l'inclusion sociale. De telles places publiques favorisent le regroupement de personnes d'origines variées pour les célébrations urbaines ou servent de centre symbolique d'une ville.

---

[5] Discussion des spécialistes, 9 mai 2006.

[6] Le concept de la porosité a été mentionné par les intervenants clés et durant les discussions avec les spécialistes. Il comprend l'accès et l'ouverture, deux éléments importants.

Transport

Le transport aide à favoriser l'accessibilité à l'intérieur de la ville et élimine l'isolation non désirée de certains groupes. Il constitue un élément clé de la porosité, et on estime que la présence ou l'adéquation du transport en commun est essentielle pour maintenir l'accès et l'inclusion des personnes qui n'ont pas les ressources nécessaires pour utiliser un véhicule automobile.

L'absence d'un service de transport en commun adéquat, auquel font face les Canadiens, et la croissance rapide des municipalités suburbaines, qui abritent également des résidents à faible revenu, sont en grande partie responsables de l'exclusion de ces groupes. On observe également l'absence de porosité dans les premiers ensembles de logements publics aménagés comme des parcs, sans voie à circulation directe.

Mixité sociale

L'application du concept de la mixité sociale semble être essentielle à l'échelle de la ville et de la métropole, toutefois, nombre de succès ont été obtenus dans des quartiers grâce à des programmes de logement social. En même temps, les processus politiques et de planification qui contrôlent les décisions doivent être accessibles et significatifs pour divers groupes. L'étude révèle qu'il est facile de trouver des exemples d'exclusion, mais il est plus difficile de trouver des exemples de pratiques d'inclusion.

D'après les discussions, les quartiers inlcusifs à tous sont axés sur le piéton et la sécurité des lieux. Toutefois, l'exemple le plus commun d'inclusion sociale se retrouve dans les quartiers où les ensembles qui ont appliqué ou tenté d'appliquer le principe de la mixité sociale—une combinaison de types de ménages et de revenus. Certains intervenants clés ont suggéré que la mixité sociale était synonyme d'inclusion sociale. Ce type de mixité sociale oriente grandement les politiques et les programmes au Canada, comme ailleurs.

Pour contrer l'effet naturel du marché, l'application de la notion de mixité sociale requiert habituellement le recours à la mise en œuvre de politiques et de programmes fédéraux, provinciaux et municipaux dans les quartiers existants et nouveaux.

Processus

Les spécialistes se sont également penchés sur le processus et ont indiqué qu'une des façons de favoriser l'inclusion sociale était de procéder à la planification et la négociation à tous les niveaux afin de faciliter les échanges sociaux. Cela suppose qu'au cours de la planification de certains aménagements qui se sont avérés des échecs, on n'a pas accordé assez d'importance à l'élément diversité. Toutefois, ils reconnaissent que le processus de consultation publique n'est pas facile ou est dispendieux, et peut également marginaliser des groupes de personnes qui n'y participent pas ou ne peuvent y participer.

CONCLUSION

Les objectifs sous-jacents de l'inclusion sociale ne sont pas nouveaux, mais il se peut que l'utilité de ce concept soit sa capacité à nous amener à réexaminer les questions de l'inégalité, de l'accès inégal aux ressources et de son impact.

Au Canada, le concept d'inclusion sociale pourrait permettre de relancer de vieux débats, en particulier dans le contexte de la diversité croissante de nos grandes régions métropolitaines. Il a même été suggéré que ce concept crée des attentes élevées vis-à-vis des changements et entraîne la mise en place d'indicateurs plus ambitieux. Le concept, combiné à la forme urbaine, focalise davantage sur les villes et leur portée du point de vue économique, politique, social et culturel, en plus de souligner l'importance du lieu et de l'intérêt par rapport à l'établissement de quartiers.

La capacité des villes à tenir compte de la diversité, comme l'illustre le processus d'aménagement des mosquées à Toronto, ou à reconnaître davantage la contribution des immigrants, comme l'illustre le travail dans le quartier de East London avec la communauté bangladaise, pourrait représenter un des plus gros défis des collectivités urbaines.

D'AUTRES RECHERCHES

Nos connaissances des liens qui existent entre l'inclusion sociale et la forme urbaine sont limitées, et la présente étude propose des projets de recherche potentiels pour combler les lacunes.

Groupes exclus

Quels sont les groupes exclus? On se doit d'aborder cette question fondamentale dans toute recherche entreprise sur les incidences de la forme urbaine et de l'inclusion sociale dans le contexte canadien.

Cette question est particulièrement importante, en raison de la nature dynamique de nos villes et du fait qu'elles abritent une concentration de plus en plus grande d'immigrants. Nombreux sont ceux qui conviendraient que les sans-abri, les immigrants et les personnes d'origine autochtone représentent les groupes les plus exclus de notre société; toutefois, nous pourrions vérifier s'il existe des gens ou des groupes qui se sentent exclus et que nous croyons ne pas l'être normalement. Par exemple :

- Se pourrait-il que le mode de vie soit la caractéristique distinctive, par rapport au mode d'occupation ou à la classe sociale?

Mixité sociale

Nombre de débats ont été tenus dans les ouvrages publiés et la littérature grise, au cours des entrevues avec les intervenants clés et chez les spécialistes au sujet de la mixité sociale, du niveau adéquat, de son rôle et de son efficacité dans la promotion de l'inclusion sociale et de la façon d'y arriver.

Une certaine confusion semble régner autour des concepts de la mixité sociale et de l'inclusion sociale, certaines personnes ayant tendance à les utiliser sans discernement. Il est certain que la mixité sociale est considérée comme une composante de l'inclusion sociale, qui semble essentielle pour les décideurs et les urbanistes qui interviennent dans le logement au Canada et qui ont adopté la notion et l'utilisent depuis des années, en particulier dans le contexte des ensembles de logements sociaux. Les recherches pourraient examiner certaines questions, notamment :

- Quels objectifs espère-t-on atteindre avec la mixité sociale?
- Quelle est la mixité sociale recherchée, vu l'évolution constante de la diversité de nos villes?

Politiques relatives à l'espace pour l'inclusion sociale

Les intervenants clés et les spécialises ont éprouvé de la difficulté à cerner les principales caractéristiques physiques d'une collectivité inclusive, et il existe peu d'ouvrages sur le sujet. Ils ont eu plus de facilité à reconnaître les obstacles présents dans une collectivité fermée.

Même les ouvrages spécialisés font ressortir les caractéristiques physiques liées à l'exclusion, bien qu'on y aborde un peu le rôle positif de la mixité sociale, de l'utilisation variée des terrains, des espaces publics et du transport. En général, cela relève des urbanistes et des politiciens locaux. Tant le manque d'ouvrages publiés que les débats de spécialistes tendent à faire ressortir l'absence d'orientation claire quant aux formes urbaines et aux éléments qui favorisent l'inclusion.

Bien qu'on souligne l'importance d'un usage varié des terrains, de l'accès au transport en commun, des espaces publics dans les centres-villes et de la mixité sociale, on note le manque de lignes directrices quant à l'aspect que ces éléments doivent prendre et à leur performance. Durant la recherche, les intervenants clés et les spécialistes ont abordé le concept de la porosité. Si, en fait, la mixité sociale à petite échelle n'est pas importante, et que la porosité, qui englobe l'accès et l'ouverture, l'est, alors il pourrait s'avérer essentiel de comprendre comment favoriser l'application de ce concept. Au cours de recherches ultérieures, on pourrait aborder les questions suivantes :

- Quelle genre d'utilisation variée des terrains recherche-t-on?
- Quelles sont les meilleures façons d'y arriver?
- Et à quelle échelle?

Ces recherches, ainsi que celles antérieures et en cours, pourraient servir à compiler des données ou des indicateurs reliant les caractéristiques physiques et sociales d'une collectivité. Ensuite, ces renseignements pourraient aider à mieux comprendre la définition, le processus et le développement de l'inclusion sociale dans la forme urbaine, ce qui permettrait d'améliorer la vie de nombreux habitants au sein de chaque collectivité.

CMHC SCHL

National Office
700 Montreal Road
Ottawa ON K1A 0P7
Telephone: (613) 748-2000

Bureau national
700 chemin de Montréal
Ottawa ON K1A 0P7
Téléphone : (613) 748-2000

Puisqu'on prévoit une demande restreinte pour ce document de recherche, seul le résumé a été traduit.

La SCHL fera traduire le document si la demande le justifie.

Pour nous aider à déterminer si la demande justifie que ce rapport soit traduit en français, veuillez remplir la partie ci-dessous et la retourner à l'adresse suivante :

Centre canadien de documentation sur l'habitation
Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement
700, chemin Montréal, bureau C1-200
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0P7

Titre du rapport: _____

_____

Je préférerais que ce rapport soit disponible en français.

NOM _____

ADRESSE_____
rue App.

_____
ville province Code postal

No de téléphone ( ) _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Social inclusion has become a topic of growing interest among makers of social policy and researchers. In response, CMHC commissioned research to explore the role that a city's physical attributes, such as the pattern of streets, land use, open spaces, or transportation connections to other neighbourhoods, play in a community's social development. Housing, given its role in the urban landscape, is a major factor for consideration.

1.1 Objectives

This project has set out to explore the link between urban form and social inclusion in a Canadian context. While the mandate focussed on a review of existing research about the impact of urban form on social inclusion in Canada, the methodology used incorporated a review of recent European and North American literature. A second and very important source of information was key informant interviews with knowledgeable experts in related fields. Furthermore a number of these individuals, as well as other experts, participated in a panel discussion that examined issues that had arisen from the interviews and the literature review. The end result of identifying emerging thinking, current research and research gaps, should help to advance future research activities in this area.

Part of the challenge of this review, and of the study itself, is defining two very amorphous terms: social inclusion and urban form. The idea of social inclusion is relatively new in Canada and locating research that investigates the links with urban form proved to be a challenge. Fortunately, we could draw upon European and British experiences, as well as work carried out in Quebec. Ultimately this final report remains exploratory, with more questions than answers.

The Request For Proposals (RFP) described the following research questions:

- What is commonly understood by the term "social inclusion"?
- What are the impacts a physical community and a social community have on each other, and what factors affect these?
- What are the interactions between urban design and social inclusion and what factors affect them?
- What role does housing design/urban form play in social inclusion?
- How does housing contribute to the development of a physical environment that is inclusive?
- What qualities of physical neighbourhood/community environment and features lead to higher degrees of social inclusion and well-being, and vice versa?
- Are there individual characteristics of community design that play a greater role in contributing to the well-being of the inhabitants, such as parks, public space, mix of housing, other land use and so on?
- How can community planning, development principles and practices, and zoning practices contribute to increased belonging and strengthen community bonds amongst all groups?

- Which federal, provincial, municipal government land use, and development policies and regulations, most impact the relationship between housing/urban form and social inclusion over the short-, medium-, and long-terms, and how?
- What types of planning and/or design practices by private sector firms, other non-government organizations and communities most impact the relationship between housing design/urban form and social inclusion over the short-, medium-, and long-terms, and how?
- What can be learned from existing research about urban form and social integration? What are the main gaps that should be researched? Do those gaps involve quantitative or qualitative research?
- What data or information is available that links investment in the physical aspects of a neighbourhood and better social outcomes to community members?
- What indicators exist to measure the different dimensions of the relationship between the physical and the social aspects of a neighbourhood or a community?

These questions were used as guides to the work that was carried out. However, because of the broad scope of the research questions the resulting study can be considered exploratory only.

1.2 Method

A three-part research strategy was employed consisting of a literature review, interviews with Canadian key informants and a panel discussion.

1.2.1 Literature review

The literature review includes published research using the concept of social inclusion/exclusion. This is rare in the American literature. For this reason, few American works are included.

However, social inclusion is rooted in much older and larger concepts and can encompass notions such as social mix and social cohesion, which are explained in Section 2. Furthermore, if the concept of social inclusion is combined with urban form, the literature on spatial segregation and social sustainability is pertinent. This review has not resolved these issues, but also has not expanded the review to encompass these concepts, unless they are directly related to works or analyses of social inclusion/exclusion.

The published literature was identified using academic search engines such as EBSCO and Proquest, various university catalogues and the internet catalogues of Canadian institutions such as Muniscope (Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research - ICURR), Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), Human Resources and Social Development Canada (HRSDC), Metropolis, Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD), Laidlaw Foundation, Canadian Policy Research Network, the Roehr Institute, Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA), the Canadian Institute of Planning (CIP), the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), Smart Growth BC, and the Centre for Urban and Community Studies (CUCS) at the University of Toronto. European sources such as URBEX (The Spatial Dimensions of Urban Social Exclusion and Integration), and governmental sites such as the Social Exclusion Unit in

the UK were also included. Search terms that were used consisted of social inclusion, social exclusion, urban form, urban, city, social, urban design, and quality of life.

The original draft literature review was supplemented in this final report by literature revealed in the course of key informant interviews and the panel discussion participants. The literature review is located in Appendix A.

1.2.2 Key informant interviews

This part of the research consisted of interviews with 15 key Canadian informants to obtain their thoughts on some of the basic questions that formed the foundation of the study. Key informants included academics who have written or worked on issues of social inclusion; municipal housing and planning staff in three major urban centres; representatives of urban, architectural and planning organizations; and, social researchers.

Topics included the concept of social inclusion, the composition of the excluded, the physical attributes of an inclusive environment and examples of inclusive neighbourhoods.

These interviews also sought to identify grey literature[7] and related research that is ongoing.

The list of key informants is contained in Appendix B.

1.2.3 Panel discussion

Six people participated in a teleconference on May 9, 2006. In advance, panellists received a brief discussion paper highlighting some of the key points from the literature review and key informant interviews.

The aim of the panel discussion was to delve more deeply into some of the important questions pertaining to the links between social inclusion and urban form, and to build upon the knowledge gleaned from the literature and key informant interviews. The panel was guided through five questions and the discussion recorded.

The list of panellists is found in Appendix C.

1.3 Scope and limitations

To limit the scope of this study, given its wide mandate and exploratory nature, the focus was literature that dealt specifically with the term “social inclusion” and “urban form”. The term “social exclusion” was added to the scope as it became clear that a more abundant literature was using this more common term. However, as the first section of this report reveals, the terminology of social inclusion/exclusion may be new, but the concepts and ideas behind it are not.

[7] “Grey literature” comprises scientific and technical reports, patent documents, conference papers, internal reports, government documents, newsletters, fact sheets and theses, which are not readily available through commercial channels.

The scope of the study did not permit the review of all areas of the literature. Notably missing are the areas that are dealing with racial and ethnic segregation in the United States, the impact of gentrification in inner city neighbourhoods, crime and safety in cities, integration of immigrants or multiculturalism, which could all be highly pertinent to this type of study. Unfortunately, they are not included or alluded to briefly. Nor are some of the seminal works included that deal with issues at the heart of social inclusion and urban form, although not using that language, such as the *Death and Life of Great American Cities* by Jane Jacobs (1961).

Current work being undertaken in Canada deal with some of these issues. Many are long-range, broad and detailed studies, such as the Community University Research Alliance (CURA) project at the University of Toronto on Neighbourhood Change and Building Inclusive Communities from Within or the Metropolis Project, an international forum for research and policy on migration and cities.

Furthermore, while most of the questions described in the RFP have been addressed when they deal with the two central themes (social inclusion and urban form), the scope of the study and the lack of resources did not permit systematic analysis of each.

1.4 Report organization

The report is organized into seven sections corresponding to the stages of the research. Section 1 is the introduction, containing the study objectives, method, scope and organization.

Section 2 addresses definitions: social inclusion and the more ubiquitous term, social exclusion, as well as the various elements that emerge from the use of these terms. Early in the study process, a definition of social inclusion was proposed based on the literature reviewed. Following later stages of the work, this was amended to reflect comments received. Urban form, an equally vague concept, especially as it relates to social inclusion, is also defined to set the parameters of the study.

Section 3 describes some Canadian examples of “socially inclusive” neighbourhoods and cities identified in a preliminary way in this research. A brief description of each is offered, based on available documentation and evaluation. These examples are also cited in various locations throughout the document, where relevant. It should be noted however, that the term “inclusion” is generally not part of the vocabulary of these initiatives, since the use of this term is still relatively new and restrained in Canada.

Section 4 presents the main points arising from the key informant interviews and panel discussion.

Section 5 presents an analysis of findings on the relationship between social inclusion and urban form, based on the three research strands, including the literature, key informant interviews and panel discussion.

Section 6 offers conclusions, including a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of using the term social inclusion more widely in the Canadian context and in particular, in terms of housing policy.

Section 7 identifies knowledge gaps and presents some ideas for further research in this area.

2. DEFINITIONS

This section reports on the definitions of social inclusion and urban form offered in the literature, with some commentary incorporated based on the key informant interviews and panel discussion.

2.1 Social inclusion

2.1.1 Social inclusion and social exclusion

While the focus of this paper is on social inclusion, the related term, social "exclusion" cannot be ignored, as it is an older and more widely used term. It first appeared in France, where *les exclus* were those who had slipped through the social safety net – single parents, people who were unemployed and uninsured, especially young people, and those who were disabled. The term social inclusion, it is proposed, is "inextricably intertwined" with that of social exclusion: "Simply put, exclusion is the problem; inclusion is the solution" (Guildford 2000). Panellists reiterated this perspective noting that underneath the idea of social inclusion is that an "in" was being delineated, and therefore "if you have inclusion you will always have exclusion".

In many respects social exclusion encompasses the idea of poverty, but in a broader manner that recognises its multi-dimensional nature that is expressed not only through inadequate participation in economic life, but also deprivation at the social, cultural and political levels (Murie and Mustard 2004; Dewilde and De Keulenaer 2003; Farrington 2002) and the failures of systems, such as the legal system, the labour market, the welfare system and family and community systems, that are fundamental for society (Cushing 2003). The multidimensional nature of social exclusion can create a vicious cycle or "spiral" of disadvantage (Farrington 2002) and is the outcome of a process (Murie and Musterd 2004) that has an impact on an individual's identity, existential meaning (Blanc 1998), life chances (Berube 2005), and well-being (Clutterbuck and Novick 2003) that also can lead to the breakdown of social ties and community (Farrington 2002). It should be noted that the role of neighbourhood and its impact is not only at the level of economics. One key informant pointed out the critical role that neighbourhoods play in the trajectories of inclusion or exclusion for immigrants.

While these explanations and definitions of social exclusion are broad, some of the dimensions lend themselves more easily to analysis and measurement and can be linked with urban form. These components include:

- To be excluded from economic, social or political life implies a lack of **access** to resources that permit integration and inclusion, which often have clear spatial manifestations (Madanipour 1998) such as lack of physical accessibility for persons with disabilities, as well as including the "voiceless" and the "powerless" in shaping policies (Cushing 2003).

- Opportunities for **choice** (Cushing 2003) and one of the key values in a diverse society (Clutterbuck 2001).

- The ability to fully **participate** within families, communities and societies is considered to part of inclusion (Cushing 2003). This has implications for governance and democracy. For example, Myer Siemiatycki of Ryerson University has found that while 47% of the population of the Greater Toronto Area was born outside of Canada, they are not proportionally represented on the Toronto City Council, which implies that their interests are not being represented – this is where democratization and inclusion takes place.[8]

2.1.2 The idea of social inclusion

If social exclusion is the process that denies people access, participation and choice, then social inclusion can be interpreted as being value-laden and normative, incorporating social justice, diversity that is valued; opportunities for choice; entitlement to rights and services; working together (Cushing 2003). As one key informant pointed out, the concept of social inclusion, for all of its analytical and theoretical weaknesses, has helped foster a vision of basic social rights that encompasses education, employment and housing. The panel discussion on the concept or idea of social inclusion also was divided about the utility of the term, but it was agreed that while social inclusion may not be universally seen as useful, there was agreement that the adjunct idea of social justice was.

The initial definition that was proposed for this study is:

> the situation in which individuals and communities (both physical and demographic) are fully integrated into the society in which they reside/occur/exist, including the economic, social, cultural and political dimensions of that society.

The idea of integration contained within that definition raised concerns about assimilation, appropriation, social control, if not genocide by key informants who represented the perspective of aboriginal populations, either directly or through their work. One suggestion was to replace "integrated" in the society with the word "involved". This same concern was found in roundtable discussions undertaken by the Laidlaw Foundation, where the term was found to "smack of 'cultural assimilation' and 'social integration'" for ethno-racial and Aboriginal communities (Clutterbuck 2001). Another key informant found that the definition was a centralist concept and that to be truly inclusive a society would have to be homogenous, something that goes against the principle of a multicultural society.

Based on these comments, the revised definition that is used for this study is:

> the situation in which individuals and communities (both physical and demographic) are fully 'involved' in the society in which they reside/occur/exist, including the economic, social, cultural and political dimensions of that society.

2.1.3 Related terms

Related terms such as social cohesion and social mix are sometimes used interchangeably with social inclusion, however, they are distinct. As Cushing (2003) points out, social cohesion "is constructed upon shared values, a common discourse and

[8] Key informant interview. March 31, 2006.

a reduction of gaps in riches and revenues." Avoiding disparities and potential polarization is the key aim of social cohesion policies. Social mix, on the other hand, refers to the composition of different economic, demographic and households groups within a geographic area and prevailing theories hold that a socially mixed neighbourhood is beneficial, although this has not necessarily been proven.

2.2 Urban form

A review of the literature touching on the definition of urban form occurred early on in the study process. We adopted Lynch's (1989) definition of "settlement form" as most closely approximating the broad conception outlined in the Request for Proposals. This definition addresses both physical form, as well as the control of space:

> …settlement form is the spatial arrangement of persons doing things, the resulting spatial flows of persons, goods and information, and the physical features which modify space in some way significant to those actions, including enclosures, surfaces, channels, ambiences, and objects. Further, the description must include the cyclical and secular changes in those spatial distributions, the control of space and the perception of it. The last two, of course, are raids into the domains of social institutions and of mental life.

The scale at which the discussion takes places is important. Are we concerned with urban form at the neighbourhood level, the city level and/or the regional level? The key informants and panel both raised this issue. For the purposes of this study, all are pertinent and Lynch's definition encompasses all three.

Song and Knaap (2004) suggest that the neighbourhood is the basic building block of urban form. According to Bramley and Power (2005) the specific elements, dimensions, or building blocks of urban form are street design and circulation systems, density, land use mix, building and housing type, accessibility and pedestrian access.

Others hold that urban form is the relationship of the central business district to the outer areas/suburbs or the "pattern" of city structure. For instance, Nelson (1982) describes several classic models of city structure – concentric circle, wedge or sector theory, and multiple nuclei, which are distinguished by the relationship and location of different land uses and periods of development, including the resulting shape or pattern. This conception has more to do with regional level analyses, and the relationship with social inclusion would be linked to the social consequences of urban sprawl. Indeed the central debate in the urban form literature concerns the merits of the compact city versus continued suburbanization.

Another conception has to do with public versus private space. Scott and Horner (2004), in an exploratory empirical analysis of the relationship between urban form and social exclusion, define urban form as "urban opportunities" which consist of "…all locations other than private residences where individuals can engage in non-work, non-school activities."

2.3 Social inclusion and urban form

The definitions of urban form become more precise if it is examined through the lens of social inclusion. For example, Madanipour (1998) in the definition of the relationship between space and social exclusion suggests that:

> It is access to decision making, access to resources, and access to common narratives, which enable social integration. Many of these forms of access have clear spatial manifestations, as space is the site in which these different forms of access are made possible or denied. There is a direct relationship between our general sense of freedom and well-being with the choices open to us in our spatial practices the more restricted our social options, the more restricted will be our spatial options, and the more excluded we feel or become.

Panellists agreed that there is a link between social inclusion/exclusion and urban form. The design and form of our cities, at both the micro (site planning) and macro (metropolitan) level, can facilitate inclusion or exclusion or at the very least, serve to maintain it. Neighbourhoods in particular are a focus of concern. Neighbourhood effects, or the social interactions that occur close to one's residence that affect social and economic well-being, are the potential vehicle for inclusion/exclusion

Neighbourhoods have an impact on their residents in three ways: intrinsic and well-established characteristics (e.g. location, transportation infrastructure, housing, economic base, etc.); residential sorting either through the private market or public policy that will concentrate "the most disadvantaged people in the least advantaged neighbourhoods; and, once the disadvantage is established, more disadvantages may be acquired (e.g. reputation, environment, services), further limiting the opportunities to residents (Lupton and Power 2002). Berube (2005) in reviewing studies of neighbourhood effects finds that concentrations of poverty result in private sector activity, limit job networks and employment ambitions, stimulate higher levels of crime and disorder, exacerbate health inequalities, and have an impact on educational attainment. In the latter case, one study has found that the intake characteristics and neighbourhood wealth have a greater impact on the probability of primary school success than teacher qualifications and expenditures per pupil. A Canadian review of empirical evidence of neighbourhood effects concluded, "residential environment matters most to an individual's mental health and exposure to crime, but has little influence on self-sufficiency [earnings, education attainment unemployment and social assistance outcomes] and child development (Oreopoulos 2005).

The concept of social exclusion lends itself an analysis of area-specific factors (Buck 2001), including the concentration of poverty (Murie and Musterd 2004; Cushing 2003). Much of the concern and research about concentrations of poverty has taken place in the US, with more recent UK focus on disadvantaged communities. Work in Canada points to similar spatial trends. An example of the spatial nature of inequality can be found in the United Way's *Poverty by Postal Code* study in Toronto. It looked at the changes in the geography of poverty over a twenty-year period, from 1981 to 2001 (United Way and Canadian Council on Social Development ND) and found that the concentration of family poverty is increasing. Twenty years ago, the vast majority of Toronto's 'poor' economic families lived in mixed-income neighbourhoods: for example, from 1981 to 2001, the proportion of 'poor' families residing in higher poverty

neighbourhoods rose from almost 18% to 43%. Additionally, the increase in the number of higher poverty neighbourhoods has been especially acute in the inner suburbs.

Marcuse (1997) in a discussion of the separation of different parts of city from each other, while acknowledging that these are not new, especially those based on race and class, does draw some distinctions between different types of separation: the ghetto, which is involuntary and racially defined; the enclave in which a group self-defined by ethnicity or religion separates itself to enhance economic, social, political, and/or cultural development; the citadel, in which a group with superiority in power, wealth, and/or status in relation to its neighbours congregates as means to enhance position. Choice and self-exclusion are essential elements of the latter two categories that Marcuse identifies, but a newer trends he notes is that of "totalizing" neighbourhoods in which not only residential but other services are contained within the separated part (e.g. edge cities).

The panel discussion focused on the extent or strength of the relationship: there is "clearly a relationship between built form… [and social inclusion] at all scales. It's not deterministic, but powerful."[9] Panellists felt that the goal of urban form should be to create inclusion in natural ways, with the recognition that form can facilitate/promote inclusion, but can not create it.

[9] Panel discussion. May 9, 2006.

3. CANADIAN EXAMPLES OF SOCIALLY INCLUSIVE NEIGHBOURHOODS

This section provides a discussion of Canadian neighbourhoods or communities that were identified by key informants or in the literature as examples of "socially inclusive" communities. There are a number of caveats.

Firstly, as has been demonstrated, there is a lack of clarity around the term social inclusion and related terms such as social mix, social cohesion, and a tendency to equate social mix with social inclusion.

Secondly, there has been no assessment of the inclusiveness of any of these neighbourhoods. Indeed most of the planned developments and neighbourhoods have not been evaluated on any basis, with the exception of False Creek South in Vancouver and St. Lawrence in Toronto, which were evaluated based on the achievement of social mix targets.

When compared to the working definition used in this report, there are no clear examples that look at social inclusion and urban form specifically. This section is included because the key informants and panel used these neighbourhoods as illustrative examples of social inclusion. Brief descriptions are provided using available published information and website documentation. Findings from evaluative studies of False Creek South and the St. Lawrence neighbourhood are included to shed some light on how dimensions of the physical environment, such as social mix and housing form affect the social quality of life. This was not possible for the other neighbourhoods described below, as they have not been assessed using a social lens. However, it would be a useful topic of future study.

Several of the neighbourhoods are planned communities developed in the 1960s to 1980s by municipal governments. Others are established neighbourhoods within urban areas. Still others are in the planning or development phase and have adopted policies or goals, which are consistent with social inclusion, although typically not using that term.

3.1 Planned communities

3.1.1 False Creek South, Vancouver

False Creek South was created in the 1970s from the redevelopment by the City of Vancouver of former industrial lands to residential and commercial uses. Completed in 1990, the area comprises 2,811 housing units and a population of 4,900 residents. A park, elementary school, shops, and marinas are part of this medium density neighbourhood. The City of Vancouver wanted to reflect the population, age, and income mix of the Vancouver metropolitan area and ensure that no one be excluded from living in False Creek because of age, income or stage in lifecycle. There was a deliberate attempt to promote a social mix by attracting families with children to the inner city, in addition to singles, couples, seniors and people with disabilities. A range of incomes was

also envisioned, and both subsidized and unsubsidized housing were intended to accomplish this, along with a mix of housing types.

An early evaluation of False Creek South found that the actual demographics of residents broadly represented the metropolitan area mix, but that children, teens, and seniors were slightly under-represented. It also noted a decline in low-income households living in the neighbourhood between the 1981 and 1986 censuses, and cautioned that rising real estate prices and changing demographics might make it difficult to maintain the social mix (City of Vancouver 1989).

A later evaluation concluded that False Creek South achieved a significant degree of social mix, but that, as of 1996, the original social mix targets had been missed (City of Vancouver 2001). There were fewer families with children and more elderly than targeted, but there was also a higher proportion of high-income groups and lower proportion of low income groups than targeted. It noted that the divergence had increased since 1981, because earlier phases were on City-owned land and had a higher proportion of non-market housing. Although falling short of its target, the area was nevertheless considerably more balanced than the neighbouring Fairview Slopes residential development, which was developed at the same time, but with no social mix policy (and no social housing).

A post-occupancy evaluation of the False Creek South project in Vancouver concluded that the social mix that was achieved had little effect (Vischer Skaburskis Planners 1980). It found that the impact of social mix on residents is not pronounced, that it is acceptable to most residents and that is has not changed their lives. Specifically:

- There is a trend towards social homogeneity over time;
- The administrative effort to achieve fine grained social mix is not warranted compared to the results;
- Planning involvement is the best predictor of non-market resident satisfaction with social mix;
- Quality of the physical environment is crucial to mutual tolerance of different social groups;
- Social benefits of “sense of community” accrue to higher income, market households;
- Higher income resident satisfaction is only evident by their choice to live and remain there;
- Social mix has no negative effect on “neighbouring” behaviours and community patterns, but sponsor group involvement may have.

3.1.2 St. Lawrence Neighbourhood, Toronto

The redevelopment of the formerly industrial and under-utilized land into the residential and commercial enclave called St Lawrence was initiated in the 1970s in Toronto, as a response to poorly functioning public housing projects, like Regent Park. It was the first major undertaking of the City of Toronto’s newly formed Housing Department. The first of the total 3,520 units were occupied in 1979 and the neighbourhood was completed in 1990. The neighbourhood was completely integrated with the surrounding area utilizing a grid pattern.

The social mix objectives incorporated many elements: age, income, tenure, household size, household type, and families with children. The targets evolved over time as the original target of 50% for low and moderate-income households became impossible due to changing federal subsidy programs, which stipulated a maximum of 25% rent geared to income in one project. It is important to note that the aim of St. Lawrence was the physical integration of different household types, not social integration.

Studies of the project have deemed it a success from a social mix perspective and evidence demonstrates the importance of physical site planning and building form, social planning decisions (especially regarding the social mix), and an open and democratic planning process. However attention to the physical form and site planning is not enough to develop new neighbourhoods; they require social planning as well (Hulchanski 1990).

Hulchanski (1990) concluded that “on the basis of almost any evaluative criteria” the project has been very successful in meeting its original goals and objectives for social mix, achieving 57% non-market housing and 16% family units.

In both False Creek and St. Lawrence, achieving the social mix objectives depended heavily on the availability and composition of federal government social housing programs. Hulchanski (1990) also noted federal assistance with the land purchase.

3.1.3 Milton Parc, Montréal

Threatened with demolition in the 1970s and following the redevelopment of part of the site into five high-rise towers, the Milton Parc project began in 1979. The project consists of 616 units in 146 building organised into co-ops (16) and non-profit organisations (6) as well as commercial spaces. The project resulted in modifications to the existing federal social housing program that was operating at the time, which allowed “in situ” tenants to continue to remain in their units without having huge rent increases following the major renovations that were undertaken. Further modifications to the provincial and municipal renovation programs allowed conservation of existing rooming houses and retention of their residents. In 1987, the Communauté Milton Parc (CMP), a condo association of all the Milton Parc organisations was incorporated. The Declaration of Co-ownership specifies elements such as selection criteria to live in the projects (i.e. admissible income and minimum occupancy level). The community has been engaged in other activities since the project began, notably the redevelopment of an abandoned local school into a cultural centre and the advocacy (and victory) in redesign of a major artery through the neighbourhood.

3.1.4 Frankel-Lambert, Toronto

The area comprising the Frankel-Lambert neighbourhood was rezoned in 1978 to permit a new low-density residential neighbourhood with new streets, public parks and a mix of street-related row housing and apartment buildings. At that time, half of the area was occupied by the Frankel Steel Company and the other half was a mix of provincial, Metro Toronto and City-owned properties.

3.2 Existing communities

3.2.1 Centretown, Ottawa

Centretown is an inner city neighbourhood in Ottawa that contains a mix of income groups, a Community Health Centre and Community Centre. Much of the income mix is attributed to Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corporation's social housing portfolio.

3.2.2 Grandview Woodlands, Vancouver

Grandview Woodlands is an inner city neighbourhood in east Vancouver that is home to a mix of income and cultural groups. Originally an Italian immigrant neighbourhood, it now accommodates a variety of groups including students, the lesbian community, Latin American and other immigrants, Aboriginal households, artists and musicians.

3.3 Under development

3.3.1 Angus Shops, Montréal

Former site of the Canadian Pacific Railroad maintenance shops, the project is being undertaken in two phases. Phase 1 (1983-1994) involved the creation of a city non-profit organisation (The Société des terrains Angus) and included 2,587 units comprised of 1,544 private housing units (condo, single family, and rental units) and 1,043 social housing units (552 co-ops, 299 public housing units, and 192 non-profit units). In Phase 2 (1998-2007) Canadian Pacific is planning a mix of uses – 40% industrial, 20% commercial, and 40% residential (i.e. 1200 housing units, of which 600 will be row housing, 160 condos, 315 seniors, 125 rental).

3.3.2 Benny Farm, Montréal

Undergoing redevelopment on a site owned by Canada Lands Company and initially developed in 1947 for veterans, the new development will offer about 530 housing units for low to average income households. The housing mix will include co-ops and non-profit housing (about 200 units), using the provincial/municipal social housing program, as well as private rental units and homeownership (about 225 units for low and medium income households). Over a third of the homeownership units will be for first-time home buyers. The non-profit and co-op housing will address the needs of seniors, young families, single mothers and people with limited mobility. Part of the site has been set aside for neighbourhood services including a social and health centre and a City recreation centre that will include a swimming pool, gym, and community rooms.

One of the design elements of the redevelopment is the piercing through of the extension of a neighbourhood street into the project to better integrate the site to the rest of the local area. (The original project was based on a garden city design, with a building/street pattern that did not repeat the local grid pattern.)

3.3.3 Regent Park redevelopment, Toronto

The 2.43 hectare site currently has 2,087 units comprising Canada's largest and oldest public housing project. The current population of over 7,500 consists of a high proportion

of children (12% are 0-4 years and 34.5% are 5-19 years) as well as large communities of immigrant families from Somalia, Bangladesh, the Congo, Vietnam, China and Latin America.

The redevelopment proposes 4,500 mixed-income units (3,700 apartments and 800 townhouses) as well as mixed-use buildings that will include retail, commercial and institutional uses. Space will also be provided for educational activities as well as economic development initiatives. The proposed design includes breaking up the two existing “mega-blocks” that make up the project and breaking them up into a pattern of public streets and blocks as well as open spaces and parks. The original street network will be reintroduced, connecting the new and surrounding neighbourhood.

3.3.4 Southeast False Creek, Vancouver

Planning is underway for the redevelopment of former industrial lands on Southeast False Creek (SEFC), the future site of the 2010 Winter Olympics athletes’ village. SEFC is being planned as a model sustainable development based on environmental, social and economic principles where people will live, work, play, and learn. SEFC will be a mixed-use community, with a focus on residential housing for families. This complete community will ensure goods and services are available within walking distance and that housing is linked by transit and in proximity to local jobs. SEFC will eventually be home to 12,000 to 16,000 people.

3.3.5 Woodwards Building, Vancouver

The Woodward's building, located in the 100 block of West Hastings in Vancouver, has long played a pivotal role in the city. It once provided food, household goods, and employment to many people in the local community and beyond. The City of Vancouver purchased the Woodward's building from the Province of British Columbia in March 2003. The City began a process to involve the community and other residents in designing and planning the redevelopment of the building in a way that is socially, environmentally, and economically sustainable. One of the guiding principles of the development is “to be open and inclusive”. The project calls for a mix of up to 500 market and 200 non-market housing units (a combination of both family and singles’ units), with the possibility of an additional 36 accessible units. Also included in the proposal are shops and services, community amenity space, public green space, a daycare, and a post-secondary education facility. City Council has selected a developer and construction is to begin in the summer of 2006, with completion in 2009.

4. KEY INFORMANTS AND PANEL DISCUSSION

This section reports on the main findings of the key informant interviews and panel discussion that together with the literature review provide the basis for this study. The first part of this section deals with the key informant interviews, and Section 4.2 provides a summary of the key themes and findings from the panel discussion.

4.1 Key informant interviews

Fifteen Canadian key informants participated in this study. They were selected because they have worked or published in this area, or represent an organization with an interest or stake in this issue. They possess a range of experience and professions, although many are academics and urban planners or both. The list of key informants is contained in Appendix B. Key informants were asked a series of questions about the link between social inclusion and urban form. The purpose of this component of the research was to expand our knowledge on the topic from the limited Canadian literature. In both cases, the responses are described by question.

Do you think that the idea of social inclusion is a useful one in the Canadian situation?

There was no consensus on this question however the following main ideas express the key contributions.

- Confusion/lack of clarity

It's a useful concept but there is some confusion around its meaning, and the use of similar terms, such as social mix. Some informants were concerned that social inclusion is being used in so many ways that it may lose its utility: the term is overused, and, therefore, it means everything and nothing. One informant felt social inclusion is a polite term for combating discrimination (i.e. exclusion is equal to discrimination) but that it was not as applicable in Canada as elsewhere. He thought it would be better to use plainer English to avoid confusion.

- Social exclusion

Many informants expressed the view that it was impossible to discuss or think about social inclusion without the corollary "social exclusion". It is easier to use the term exclusion than inclusion because the boundaries are more clearly defined. Social inclusion is useful as an objective or goal, but exclusion is more useful from a policy point of view, i.e. what barriers to remove?

- Assimilation

Some informants had a problem with the word "integration" in the initial definition and its implication of assimilation. This was especially problematic for those key informants working in a First Nations context. They thought the notion of "integrated" should be substituted by "involved" in the society. (NB: The definition that has been retained (see Section 2) eliminates the use of the word "integrated".)

There was a feeling that social inclusion may be a centralist concept and that not only does it imply assimilation, but there is an inevitable defining of "in". Some held the view that no society is really socially inclusive – it would have to be a culture that is homogenous. Others suggested that if you have inclusion, there will always be exclusion.

- Raises important issues

Others liked the proposed definition – they found it clear, broad and useful as a goal. However, they noted it raises question of scale - is social inclusion meaningful at the neighbourhood level or city level? It was pointed out that social inclusion should not be an absolute goal, as the goal is not about integration or sameness, but rather it is about access and choice. It was seen to be relevant because it captures concepts of "access" to community support and "capacity" to develop relationships and that it goes beyond absolute poverty that has been the central issue for social policy making for many years.

Are there other terms that you think convey the same idea? What are these?

There were several different terms that key informants thought were related, or in some cases synonymous. These include:

- Cohesive community

For some key informants the idea of "cohesive community" was the closest to that of social inclusion and with some of the same implications. For some the issue of "social" is one that is difficult and may be limiting: the issue of inclusion on a community level is not just social but also economic, cultural, and demographic.

- Assimilation

For some, synonyms for social inclusion would be assimilation, genocide, appropriation, and social control, particularly for people representing the Aboriginal perspective, but also the immigrant perspective.

- Social mix

Some key informants reverted to the use of other terms during the conversation, like social mix, mixed income, inclusive, integration, social sustainability, social equity, gentrification (for social exclusion) etc. Social mix was substituted most frequently.

- Social citizenship

An emerging and complementary term is social citizenship that refers to not just formal citizenship status, but the ability of an individual to participate in society.

- Human security

The term human security, used in political science, is becoming more broadly defined to go beyond the absence of violence to issues around well being.

Do you think that there are particular populations that are more affected by this phenomenon than others (e.g. immigrants, aboriginal persons, homeless persons)?

For the most part, key informants agreed that the groups identified in the question (immigrants, aboriginal persons and homeless persons) are socially excluded. However others were identified by key informants:

- Different degrees of exclusion/inclusion

It was noted that the three groups mentioned experience different degrees of exclusion. For example, the stronger the immigrant group, the less culturally integrated it is and because of this strength, might not feel as threatened by integration.

- Intersections

It was emphasized that we should not forget intersections of diversity as potentially socially excluded groups, for example, homeless immigrants etc.

- More groups excluded

Some informants had a very broad conception of who is excluded. They felt anyone who is not part of the dominant culture, that is anyone who is not white, male, financially secure, 18-65 years old, a university graduate, politically conservative, is merely being "invited in". Specifically included here were single parents, large families, public housing residents, elderly people, people with disabilities, youth, and virtually anyone living in poverty. In this view, there are not many groups that haven't been excluded since it is very easy to fall out of the mainstream.

Do you think this manifests itself in a physical way? If yes, how? Do you have examples?

Key informants identified the following physical manifestations of "social exclusion".

- Public housing "estates"

Social exclusion is visible in some of the older large public housing estates such as Regent Park. They tend to be the "typical" or most obvious physical manifestation of social exclusion. Public interventions in the 1950s and 60s may have caused exclusion. Both the concentration of poverty and the physical form of the public housing contribute to exclusion. For example, there is typically no public access to public housing projects such as Regent Park and this inaccessibility means it is difficult to police, resulting in problems of crime.

- Ghettos versus enclaves

Ghettos with their implicit lack of choice are seen as exclusionary, while enclaves, created out of choice, are not. Many public housing estates might be characterized as "ghettos" because of the homogeneity, poverty, and lack of choice. However, there are examples of neighbourhoods that are homogenous and not considered exclusionary, such as Little Italy and Chinatown. They are generally seen in a positive way or as an enclave. However, some ethnic concentrations prove problematic, although the reasons for this remain unclear. Montréal neighbourhoods with high concentrations of Haitians are examples.

- Suburbs

The periphery of the city is becoming an area of concentrated poverty. With gentrification, poorer groups in society are tending to be pushed out of downtowns. A map of the gentrified areas of the former city of Toronto shows there are very few low/moderate income neighbourhoods remaining. Those that remain are generally social/public housing, for example, St Lawrence in Toronto. Transit accessibility in suburbs is a major social equity question and automobile oriented land use means that without access to a car, one cannot get around. The lack of public spaces in the suburbs is also a contributing factor (this is an important dimension to social inclusion).

- Privatized space

Privatized public space is exclusionary. Malls are designed with blank walls that are not very inclusive. Gated communities are another physical example of privatized space that is exclusionary.

How does it occur?

The physical manifestation of exclusion occurs in two ways. Firstly exclusion is evident in the physical form of the city/neighbourhood according to where people live. Visible minorities with education can't get a good job, so they accept a minimum wage job, and must live in poorer areas. Secondly, exclusion and segregation lead to neglect of private and public spaces. Poor neighbourhoods can be well maintained; but poor and socially excluded neighbourhoods will not be, so the process snowballs.

Exclusion also occurs through transition, for example, in a changing economy, with a loss of manufacturing jobs. In Etobicoke, Toronto, the housing stock is being re-occupied with lower income households, and private and public investment is declining.

The private housing market has created exclusion over the last 30 years. It has driven up prices which has meant that certain people are excluded from certain neighbourhoods.

Social inclusion - Key informants had greater difficulty identifying physical manifestations of "social inclusion".

- Walkability

Walkability is one of the characteristics of a strong neighbourhood, which promotes face-to-face interaction.

- Physical safety

If people are afraid of crime, then they will be isolated and therefore excluded. Women alter their use of space because of fear and this is exclusionary.

Can you think of an example of a successful, inclusive community, neighbourhood, project or even city? What is it that makes this outstanding?

The examples ranged in scale and in many cases, the term social mix is substituted for socially inclusive.

- New neighbourhoods

Many informants identified large-scale urban redevelopment projects; neighbourhoods designed to be "socially mixed", such as False Creek in Vancouver or St. Lawrence in Toronto. Few mentioned pre-existing neighbourhoods. False Creek was seen to be inclusive because it is a mixed income neighbourhood with non-profit housing, a vibrant community association, a community centre, and there was an intentional and inclusive planning process. Similarly, according to one key informant, present residents of St. Lawrence describe it as vibrant and healthy, with access to facilities and services, and interactions among residents.

Some informants felt that in Montréal Angus has been inclusionary – especially the first phase, which included social housing. The second phase that is under construction will be mostly homeownership. However, it was felt by an informant that the overall statistics will reveal that Angus is "inclusionary".[10]

- Existing neighbourhoods.

Many informants noted that in almost any city there are organically created inclusive communities like Danforth, Riverdale, and the Annex in Toronto, and Main St. or Grandview Woodlands in Vancouver. At the neighbourhood level, most communities are inclusive and function really well, but the relation with the rest of the City may not be as good. For example, the current Regent Park functions well as a community but it does not relate well to the rest of the City.

Centretown in Ottawa was cited as a good example of an existing neighbourhood where planning has preserved a pre-existing social mix in spite of gentrification. A plan done 30 years ago set out to keep the existing mix in the community and a non-profit housing corporation, formed to develop social housing through purchase and preservation of existing housing, has been critical in achieving a socio-economic mix.

- No socially inclusive neighbourhoods

Other key informants were of the opinion that there are no socially inclusive neighbourhoods in Canada. The whole idea of inclusive neighbourhoods within an overall exclusive society is untenable.[11]

- Potentially inclusive neighbourhoods

Key informants identified several areas or projects currently in the planning phase that are designed to be inclusive. However, it was noted that planners can provide opportunities for public interaction through design, but cannot "create" social interaction. "Space is like a string, you can pull it but can't push it."

These include the Woodwards project in downtown Vancouver, Lavo in Hochelaga-Maisonneuve. In Montréal, five to seven projects are planned under the new City of Montréal Inclusion Strategy.

- Cities and immigrants

An underlying theme among the informants was the issue of immigrants and diversity. How immigrants are accepted and integrated into the city is a key indicator or pre-condition of inclusivity. At the city level, Toronto does this better than some cities. There

[10] Topic was not discussed in greater detail.

[11] Topic was not discussed in greater detail.

is emerging recognition that it is an immigrant city. Winnipeg too, has always viewed itself as an immigrant city. There have been some problems, but some success stories as well. Vancouver was moving in that direction under the former mayor. It's a question of vocabulary and emphasis on inclusiveness in decision-making – an issue of leadership. There has been some press about the Mennonite community in Manitoba welcoming people from Africa. Although the welcoming community is monolithic, there seems to be an attempt to reach out.

Current work and other key informants - Interviews ended with questions about work that key informants might have been undertaking or are aware. Where possible, completed studies were integrated into the literature review. Ongoing studies or research projects are included in Section 7 (Further Research). Potential key informants suggested were contacted and, if possible interviewed or invited to participate in the panel discussion.

4.2 Panel discussion

A panel discussion was held on May 9, 2006 with six participants listed in Appendix C. The panel was successful despite the small number of participants. Although we had aimed to have 12 to 15 panellists, it seemed that timing and workloads just made this impossible. The panel was able to confirm some of the findings of the literature review but also shed some light on unanswered questions. Importantly, the panel also raised some related questions. The following are the main themes that arose in the discussion of the questions.

Is social inclusion (NB using the revised definition) a valid goal for Canadian cities and neighbourhoods? If so, why?

The panel thought this should be divided into two questions: Is social inclusion a meaningful concept? Is it a valid goal?

- Nothing new here

This response echoed what others in this field have said: that social inclusion is just a new term for an old preoccupation with social equity. In effect, there is nothing new here – "social inclusion means nothing". Is it simply that having a fair and equal society is better than the opposite? It's an old question, with new terminology: fundamentally a motherhood issue. Panellists echoed the problem cited by the key informants about the term's lack of clarity. For example, among the disabled population, people are using the term inclusion in the narrow sense, meaning accessibility.

- Useful

The idea of social inclusion is useful to the extent that it promotes discussion about the issues of segregation, social mix, etc. It is also of current interest because urban Canada is becoming more exclusionary and less inclusive. Mapping in Toronto shows gentrification and impact on inner suburbs between 1971 and 2001. Social status has declined over the period and people have no choice but to live in the inner suburbs.

When asked whether social inclusion was a valid goal, some participants responded that it would be better to ask whether it is a good idea and achievable. The panel then began

to discuss whether the opposite, segregation, is necessarily bad. There was consensus that the key consideration was whether the segregation is forced or voluntary. Forced segregation is exclusionary, whereas voluntary segregation is not. For example, the Jewish community is self-segregated, but it is not actively keeping others out, so is not exclusionary. Numerous panel discussion participants felt that social inclusion is not necessarily a goal at the neighbourhood level.

- Scale

The panel was very clear on this. At a small scale, homogenous neighbourhoods are preferable and social inclusion is not necessarily a valid goal. Many studies have shown that relationships are better in relatively homogenous neighbourhoods, particularly if they are not forced. However, at the city and metropolitan scale, exclusion and inequality are a problem - heterogeneity is needed.

- Cultural inclusion

Again the idea of cultural inclusion was raised. Some panellists felt cultural inclusion is THE important question today and probably a more relevant goal than social inclusion. Cultural exclusion can occurs when diverse people are living together with some groups more powerful than others. There can be physical manifestations of this tension, for example through imposition of how public space can be used. Other examples cited were recent controversies over places of worship.

How important is urban form in achieving social inclusion?

- Urban form is significant

The physical manifestation of city has a significant impact on people's choices. The panel agreed that urban form could help "maintain" exclusion, and/or "promote" exclusion, sometimes intentionally. Some design efforts use form to exclude explicitly and implicitly. It is not deterministic, but powerful.

- Cultural inclusion?

There are two elements - accessibility and acceptance of new built forms such as mosques. The central issue is how to manage the cohabitation of different uses of space? Cultural inclusion is not necessarily linked with a specific urban form.

- Scale

Urban form at all scales - site, neighbourhood, city, and metropolitan – plays a role in social inclusion. At the micro level – homeless people are kept from using public spaces by means of certain park bench designs or landscape designs. At the metropolitan level some would claim that the form of postwar suburbs - low density and poorly equipped with transit – promote exclusion.

- Other factors

In Netherlands the gap between those with the most and least income is less dramatic and visible than in Canada. If Canada had a more equitable distribution of income, would we be having this discussion? Is the reason for social exclusion purely economic or ethnic? Urban form plays a role in promoting or maintaining social inclusion but let's not overstate its importance. This points to the perhaps larger contribution of other factors such as economics in affecting social inclusion.

How would we recognise an inclusive neighbourhood? What are the physical qualities? What are the social qualities?

Following some of the discussion about scale and the desirability of small-scale (e.g. neighbourhood) homogeneity, the panel felt that a neighbourhood focus is not appropriate in this question. Rather how would we recognize an inclusive city?

- Moving through/access

A neighbourhood can have territorial elements but if it is inclusive, others can visit and move through. Neighbourhood integrity is a good thing, but we need to consider how it is connected to the rest of the city, either because there are reasons to visit or via transportation. Examples of areas that do not promote moving through would be the current Regent Park.

- Mixed use

Mixed uses signal openness and inclusiveness. If other people have no reason to visit or go to a neighbourhood, there is a lack of vibrancy. Some large public housing projects are like this.

- Public space

High quality downtown public space that is welcoming to diverse groups of people is important for the whole city. Most problems with urban form are downtown, not in neighbourhoods. The panel spent some time discussing the current trend to over-programming of public spaces. This was viewed as a negative tendency affecting both downtowns and neighbourhoods. People have to put their mark on space and then use it. If it is over-programmed, then people who don't fit in to the programming are de facto excluded. Some public spaces area designed to be exclusionary – for example, in Toronto, Dundas and Yonge Square is a public/private space that is guarded with private security. Open public space in the "best old English tradition" was recommended.

Are there strategies or policies that can be applied to make neighbourhoods, cities or regions more inclusive? (spatial policies, housing policies?)

The panellists commented on several strategies or policies that may facilitate inclusion, but emphasized that it cannot be forced, but it can be promoted.

- Process

Involving stakeholders in the planning process is one strategy to foster inclusion. A good process can account for and respond to the ever-changing and dynamic nature of our cities. In this view, planned landscapes that don't work suffer from not enough diversity at the planning stage. An example is Harbourfront in Toronto. It was unsuccessful at mixing two objectives - profit and creating a good community. There was little public input and compromises were made. Social inclusion as a process is better at dealing with changing dynamics. However, it is a challenge to learn the planning of negotiation to facilitate social transactions between people.

- Tools and policies

There were two views on whether we, as a society or as planners, actually have the technical know-how in terms of spatial or housing policies, to facilitate social inclusion.

The first perspective holds that there is a body of knowledge about planning for socially inclusive communities, but that mistakes have been made. Past mistakes include some post war suburbs, and arguably, large public housing projects. Public parks and libraries were cited as positive examples – we do know how to create decent public spaces if the objectives are clear. However, because the private market dominates land use and is exclusionary, planners are always working to counteract this tendency.

The other view expressed by the panel is that we really don't know which spatial policies, if any, work to promote or facilitate social inclusion, or to mitigate the worst excesses of social exclusion. There doesn't appear to be a cumulative body of knowledge to draw upon. There is a lack of expertise about spatial policies and mixes that will help to minimize conflict or exclusion, and/or to promote good cohabitation or cohesion. According to this perspective, planners need guidance on best practises.

- Existing neighbourhoods

The panel felt that while planning for new neighbourhoods has a defined set of tools or techniques, the challenge lay with existing or changing neighbourhoods. There is a recognition that different approaches may be needed.

- The role of political will

Some panellists were not persuaded there is much knowledge missing but rather what was lacking was political space for planners or policy makers to make decisions that promote social inclusion. There may not be the political will to implement a potentially time consuming and costly public process.

- Land use policies - mixed use

There has been a tendency to equate mixed income with social inclusion. However, the panel seemed to conclude that it is "mixed land use" that promotes inclusion. For example, the evaluation of Phase 1 False Creek in Vancouver showed despite the achievement of a certain social mix, there was not as much interaction as expected.

- Time frame and scale

The panel noted that large-scale projects or redevelopments tend to be sanitized. They have none of the vibrancy and chaos that are present in built environments that have evolved over time and that help to promote social inclusion. The private market is not incremental by and large; it can transform a neighbourhood within a decade. Thus there is a temporal element involved in achieving inclusive environments. Policies that encourage new developments to be phased over time, to adapt and change would be beneficial.

- Social mix policies

The application of social mix policies is a question of scale. Social mix is important at the city level. At the neighbourhood level, it depends on the density. A higher density neighbourhood can sustain a broader range of groups. At a lower density it is harder to achieve a workable mix. A couple of units in a condo building is ok, but it gets complicated depending on who you are trying to mix.

It was pointed out that we used to debate social mix in terms of class and tenure. The challenge is that today there is a variety of lifestyles, for example, more people living alone, who may not mix with people with children. They may have different needs and do not necessarily fit with one another. And our constantly changing

demographic/cultural diversity means we cannot or should not be planning for a static social mix.

What don't we yet know about social inclusion, its urban form and manifestation in Canada? What would you propose as the major research questions/areas?

- Do we know how to design for diversity? Don't think we understand it and we could probably learn more about what works, perhaps from other cities or countries. For example, what are the key attributes of a socially inclusive community?

- There is confusion around social mix strategies and social inclusion. The panel struggled to answer Question 4 regarding spatial and housing strategies and policies. Should social mix occur within buildings, as in US with Cabrini Green where there is a high level mix within buildings? Or should a mix be sought at a larger scale, for example, at a project or neighbourhood level? There are at least two different approaches - which is preferred? Case studies that aren't transferable to other locations are not desirable, but planners need best practises, key ingredients, for example, on how to implement social mix.

- How do we measure social inclusion – what is it?

- What are the outcomes of the evolution of socially exclusive places? One would think they would be negative, but do we know?

- What are the feelings people have about being socially excluded? Maybe we have old ideas about who is excluded, maybe people think they are, but we don't. Are we looking at exclusion too traditionally? For example, might people with adequate financial resources be excluded? Also what is the effect of changing lifestyles, ways of life and social conditions on who is excluded?

- How can we design for constant change? People's circumstances are changing all the time. A NY Times series on class suggested there is now more mobility in and out of employment and homeownership among both the wealthy and poor.

5. ANALYSIS

"Social inclusion" and "urban form," the two terms at the heart of the study, were both amorphous and needed defining at the outset. Social inclusion proved to be much more elusive in the literature, in the interviews with key informants and in the panel discussion. The term brings to mind the parable of the elephant and the blind men – social inclusion can mean many things depending on where one stands when examining it. As this study has revealed, the term social inclusion can refer to spatial distribution of different characteristics—economic, social, and cultural—as well as the allocation of services, accessibility and process.

This section of the report analyses what has been learned from the literature, key informants, panel discussion and review of Canadian initiatives.

5.1 Definitions

Both the literature and the discussions underline that "inclusion" as such cannot be conceived without the opposing "exclusion" because they are "inextricably intertwined" as Guildford (2000) proposes, As well, because an "in" is being delineated, "if you have inclusion you will always have exclusion" as the panel discussion revealed.

However the panel discussion and key informants who represented the perspective of aboriginal populations, either directly or through their work, highlighted some of the potential perils or implications of the term - the idea of assimilation, appropriation, and social control. This same concern was found in roundtable discussions undertaken by the Laidlaw Foundation, where the term was found to "smack of 'cultural assimilation' and 'social integration'" for ethno-racial and Aboriginal communities (Clutterbuck 2001).

There also is an implication of homogeneity, underlined by a key informant who found social inclusion to be a centralist concept: to be truly inclusive a society would have to be homogenous, something that goes against the principle of a multicultural society. The literature review also revealed some of these issues and difficulties when social inclusion encompasses ideas of social cohesion, social solidarity, or the ideal of *gemeinschaft*.

While the suggestion of homogeneity can be seen as a drawback to the idea of inclusion, there also is potential strength and advantage to self-segregation and the possibility for some groups to thrive in a "protected environment". The panel discussion touched on this issue as did key informants, underlining the vibrancy and desirability of neighbourhoods such as Chinatowns. While the Laidlaw Foundation Roundtables acknowledged this right, there also was an understanding that at some "undetermined point" this could result in a fragmentation that could jeopardize social cohesion (Clutterbuck 2001).

Amin (2002) poses this dilemma as two extremes; cultural autonomy that can become separatism and "essentialised identities" and social solidarity that becomes minority cultural assimilation and western conformity. Amin suggests that part of the solution may be to draw on the political philosophy of liberalism and multiculturalism; the first with its emphasis on the rights and freedoms of individuals and the second with the emphasis

on the rights and freedom of group identities and cultures, while also strengthening the sense of belonging of all citizens.

A pre-occupation with the new multi-cultural city and the ability of immigrants to become included is a central issue and the notion of “cultural exclusion” was raised. Some panel members felt that cultural inclusion is a more meaningful and valid goal than social inclusion. Acceptance of new built forms is a key element of cultural inclusion.

Related to this issue are choice and the capacity of citizens to exercise this choice. The distinction made by Marcuse (1997) between ghetto, enclave and citadel, can be useful since it revolves around the idea of choice and access. One of the key elements that was raised by a key informant and discussed in the panel discussion is the idea of “porosity” and that while enclaves may have many positive implications for residents, access and openness are important. Thus like choice, physical access plays an important role in facilitating social inclusion. In the planned community of St. Lawrence in Toronto, a clear decision was made to maintain the existing grid pattern, to avoid the “gross physical demarcation” between the new and the old and to promote mixing of pedestrians and traffic (Hulchanski 1990). The redevelopment of Regent Park in Toronto is re-introducing the grid for these same reasons.

5.2 Social exclusion expressed in urban form

While social inclusion and exclusion can be expressed through the political process (e.g. the work of Siemiatycki on the representativeness of the Toronto City Council), it is clear that social exclusion especially (as opposed to inclusion) is powerfully expressed in urban form. Neighbourhood studies in both North America and Europe point to disparity between different areas, not only in terms of the socio-economic profile of residents, but also access to services – both public and private. Some studies, such as that of North Clondalkin, illustrate how street patterns, buildings and, over time, general “disorder” and reputation can lead to increasing isolation and exclusion of residents.

Traditional examples of the physical manifestation of exclusion are public housing estates and ghettos, while panel members asserted that (some) post-war suburbs and privatized public spaces are more current illustrations.

But exclusion is not only at the level of neighbourhoods. Clearly design (e.g. park benches designed so that people cannot sleep there) and more subtle clues (e.g. the “purposefulness” of downtown areas), including the over-programming of parks, as panel discussion participants noted, or the focus on consumption and exclusion of non-consumers in many shopping areas, as noted by some authors all play critical roles in sending out messages that not all citizens belong or are welcome.

5.2.1 Choice and access

Choice and access are critical elements in the discussion around an inclusive city and it is through these variables that urban form is linked with social inclusion. The physical manifestation of the city has a significant impact on people’s choices and their access to a city’s elements. The ability to move around freely, live where one wants, travel where one wants, is central. The idea that certain persons might be prevented from using or

passing through a certain area, by means of built form, is by definition exclusive, and might be linked to segregation.

Some of this can be explained by the predominant role of the private sector and its decision-making in housing and planning: its impact and role in fostering inclusion or exclusion cannot be overlooked according to the panel discussion. Market forces can result in intentional or unintentional by-products that exclude. Several examples were cited: gated communities and control of public space through the removal of benches so that homeless people can't sleep there. At the same time, it is acknowledged that the market (together with zoning) will tend to isolate or segregate based on the ability to pay. Larger examples of the impact of the market include gentrification and the displacement of lower income households.

The panel discussion concluded that there is "clearly a relationship between built form... [and social inclusion] at all scales. It's not deterministic, but powerful." It was felt that the goal of urban form should be to foster inclusion in natural ways, with the recognition that form can facilitate/promote inclusion, but cannot create it.

Land-use mix, public transportation, public space and social mix were the aspects of urban form that received the most attention in the Canadian literature and among the panellists, as relating to social inclusion. Urban form at all scales—the individual site, neighbourhood, city and region—plays a role in social inclusion. Scale, however, was found to mediate the nature and extent of the link between different aspects of urban form. For example, a mix of land uses is most important in the transitions among neighbourhoods or at the edges of neighbourhoods, although some hold it as important within neighbourhoods as well. Social mix is seen as critical at the level of the city and above, but potentially counterproductive at the neighbourhood level. The quality and nature of public space is vital at the metropolitan level, particularly in the downtown but can play an important role at the neighbourhood level as well.

5.3 Mixed land use

Related to the idea of "porosity" and breaking down barriers in enclosed neighbourhoods is the mix of land uses. The panellists concluded that land-use mix is one of the central elements of urban form that can promote an inclusive environment. Current zoning practices, which tend to separate uses, are partially responsible for maintaining social exclusion. Numerous key informants referred to the work of Jane Jacobs and her emphasis on the importance of mixed uses in promoting socially vital neighbourhoods and the impact not only on exchange and engagement but also on security and safety with a 24-hour city, that is, a city that lives around the clock.

The literature review revealed similar conclusions, not only in terms of density and integration of land uses as contributors to socially sustainable communities (Alexander et al 2004; Bradford 2002) but also as opportunities for exchange and crossing of paths of residents (Rose and Iankova 2004; Germain et al. 1995). The domination of the private market and the evolution of zoning controls also have resulted in uni-functional neighbourhoods, with the further exclusionary result of wealthy residents distancing themselves from the areas and problems of poorer citizens (Bartley 1998), especially with the advent of "totalising" neighbourhood (Marcuse 1997) which further reduce opportunities for crossing of paths and reasons to exchange.

Lessons from the St. Lawrence neighbourhood in Toronto point to the importance of a variety of uses, and this is being incorporated in planning for the redevelopment of Regent Park.

5.4 Public space

Tied to mixed uses is the importance of public spaces and central area or core area–downtown spaces. They are seen as an especially important component of urban form, its civic life, and the identity of the whole city. Public space, in the sense of a widely shared public core, plays a central role in the limited urban discourse about social inclusion. Such public spaces are settings that bring people with differing backgrounds together for civic celebrations or to act as the symbolic centre of a city.

While the scope of the literature review did not permit examination of work related to the evolution of city centres and their growing privatization (see Kohn 2004 for example) some of the works reviewed did emphasize the importance of a vibrant city centre as a factor in social integration (e.g. Polese and Stren 2002) while others referred to the exclusionary nature of areas devoted to consumption alone (e.g. Gilroy and Speak 1998), especially "high end" consumption (Atkinson 2003; MacLeod 2002). A key informant referred to this when discussing how the city centre was "purposeful" and unwelcoming to those without a "purpose" for being there.

Participants in the panel discussion noted a trend towards over-programming of public space in downtown areas, the concern being that groups need to put their mark on a space in order to use it. Cultural diversity makes this a significant issue if powerful or dominant groups impose regulations about how public space is used, then problems of cultural exclusion appear. Amin (2002) describes this process of limiting access as public spaces being "territorialized" by particular groups.

Public-private partnerships in the development of public space are a concern: mixing the objectives of profits with public benefits may produce unsatisfactory results. Harbourfront in Toronto is cited as an example where public/private funding did little to achieve public goals.

While public space in residential areas was also considered, the panel did not feel that this was as important as downtown public space in terms of the role in the city and its overall inclusiveness. However, this would seem to contradict the importance that was attributed to these spaces through the work in Montréal by Rose and Iankova (2004) and Germain et al. (1995).

5.5 Transportation

Transportation is a key element in porosity, and the presence or adequacy of public transit is seen as key to maintaining access and inclusion for those without the resources to use automobile-based transportation.

For the most part, the Canadian experience of inadequate public transit, to the now fast-growing suburban municipalities that are also home to lower-income residents, acts to

maintain exclusion of these groups. Lack of porosity is also seen in early public housing projects where buildings were set in “park-like” settings with no through roads.

5.6 Accessibility

In a literal sense, person with disabilities who are unable to access a subway system, enter a public building or indeed visit a friend in their home due to physical barriers, is experiencing exclusion. Clearly, physical accessibility in and around the home, the neighbourhood and the city is a key to promoting access and thus inclusion. This has been addressed to some extent by policies and regulations on accessibility and visitability contained in building codes and local government regulations. However, according to some disabled youth:

> For disabled persons, a fulsome notion of access must go well beyond the mechanical challenge of entry into buildings or the bureaucratic challenge of eligibility for civic opportunities. Access must also be about making one’s way into citizenship and human community and about feeling secure and worthy. (Frazee 2003)

5.7 Social inclusion and social mix

The study reveals that while examples of exclusion are readily available, it is much harder to find examples of inclusionary practice. One exception is the discussion of the recognition of the Bangladeshi community in East London by Gard’ner (2004). Amin (2002) also discussed an example of inclusion, but this was through the creation of a “civic space” for negotiation around the building of a mosque in Toronto.

Attention to pedestrian orientation and physical safety were cited as characteristics of “inclusive” neighbourhoods. But the most common example of social inclusion are neighbourhoods or projects that have or tried to have a “social mix”—a mix of household types and income. Some key informants suggested social mix as a synonym for “social inclusion.” This type of social mix is a strong thread in policy and programs in Canada, as elsewhere. Various Canadian examples of neighbourhoods and projects incorporating social mix objectives were revealed in the study and are described in Section 3.

To counter the natural effect of the market, achieving social mix has typically required the use of federal, provincial and municipal policies and programs both in new and existing neighbourhoods.

5.7.1 Social housing programs

Government subsidized public/social or affordable housing programs have been a key strategy for maintaining or creating socially mixed communities in the past. The fact of these programs has enabled lower income households to obtain access to neighbourhoods and live in stable affordable housing in communities they might otherwise have been unable to afford or have since gentrified. While early public housing programs were 100% subsidized and created homogenous environments, later programs adopted the terminology of social mix within each housing project. Research in Toronto has in fact shown that, in the old City of Toronto, the only remaining areas

where low-income households live are social or public housing (Hulchanski, Forthcoming). One example of an inclusionary neighbourhood that was identified by key informants was Centretown in Ottawa, where the work of a non-profit housing organisation has resulted in maintaining a mix of socio-economic groups in the face of gentrification.

Nonetheless, as the literature reveals, early social housing programs, especially in large-scale projects also have resulted in the opposite effect – increasing homogeneity and exclusion. Regent Park in Toronto is the prime Canadian example of attempts to fix "problem projects" by increasing the mix, but this concern seems to be widely shared in the US and in Europe. It is too early to evaluate the impact of these changes, but clearly some of these were caused by policies such as the "right to buy" in the UK and the consequential residualisation of public housing.

5.7.2 Inclusionary zoning and housing policies

With reduced senior government involvement in the provision of social or affordable housing, local governments in Canada and elsewhere have been looking for ways to maintain or create socially mixed communities using their limited powers. In the main, they have been employing two types of approaches: incentives, such as density bonuses, and mandatory requirements, known as inclusionary zoning. Density bonuses offer developers additional floor space in exchange for the provision of an amenity, such as affordable housing, either on site or off site. Inclusionary zoning enables local government to require that rezonings of a certain size must either a) include affordable housing or b) contribute to a fund for affordable housing. Both are used to counter the exclusionary effects of zoning and the market and as a way to promote social mix.

This tool is used extensively in the US and in some locations in British Columbia. In 1988, Vancouver City Council implemented a policy of requiring that 20% of the units in the new neighbourhoods around False Creek be designated for non-market housing to ensure that there are opportunities for low and modest income households to live in the new neighbourhoods. Since then the policy has been applied to developments along the Fraser River, Coal Harbour and elsewhere in the city. A capacity of 2,572 units has been created of which half (1,256 units) has been funded.[12] Another example is the City of Langford's "Affordable Housing, Park and Amenity Contribution Policy" which requires "that all new rezonings for 10 or more single family residential lots shall include small lot-small house affordable lots. For each group of 10 lots, the development shall provide one affordable housing unit."

Montréal has recently adopted a *Strategy for the Inclusion of Social Housing in New Developments*, an affordable housing policy. It acknowledges the importance of affordable housing as a social asset, a means to reduce the exodus of young families including children to the suburbs, and a source of economic vitality. Reasons to encourage social mix include its link to sustainable development, avoiding segregation and the cycle of poverty, and enabling sustainable communities where people can stay throughout changes to circumstances and lifecycles. The strategy targets 30% affordable housing, of which half is social housing, in larger developments by taking an incentive-based approach with tools such targeted use of existing programs and partnerships.

[12] http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/housing/about.htm

5.7.3 New developments

Neighbourhood planning for both St. Lawrence in Toronto and False Creek in Vancouver used the principle of social mix on the basis of housing type, household type, and tenure. The St. Lawrence housing mix is 57% social housing (municipal, co-ops, and non-profit) and 43% privately owned. Hulchanski (1990) concluded that "on the basis of almost any evaluative criteria" St. Lawrence has been very successful at achieving the social mix. "Certainly the spirit and to a very large degree even the specific details of the original goals and objective have been achieved."

A 2001 evaluation showed that as of 1996 False Creek did possess a mix of residents, but had achieved less than the original social mix targets. While not achieving its goals entirely, the evaluation noted that False Creek is considerably more "balanced" than the neighbouring Fairview Slopes residential development, which was developed at same time, but with no social mix policy.

In the UK the development of mixed communities appears to be relatively new. Studies have found that while people who live in them view mixed tenure communities favourably, homeowners prefer neighbourhoods where their tenure predominates and that grouping social housing units is more efficient for social housing managers. However, while putting people side by side does not guarantee that people will mix socially, clustering at one end may result in stigmatization and disorder, especially where there are high child densities. Mixed-tenure projects are still proving themselves in the UK and factors such as the phasing of affordable units may be important to establishing viability, although ultimately the policy choice may have to be a trade off between short-term market viability and longer-term sustainability (Berube 2005). New projects being developed, such as the Benny Farm site in Montréal, would be interesting to follow from this perspective, since the initial phase is primarily social housing in the centre of the site, with homeownership units planned for latter stages on the periphery.

5.7.4 Preservation of existing balances

Policies to preserve existing mixes are less developed and are often the by-product of other initiatives that in time prove to have preserved housing for a specific tenure such as rental, household type such as rooming house residents or income group. A key informant spoke about the Centretown neighbourhood of Ottawa, where 30 years ago a non-profit corporation set out to buy and manage social housing, and because of this, a mix in the community has been preserved. Similar examples would include the Milton Parc neighbourhood in downtown Montréal, which not only managed to preserve affordable housing but also preserved rooming houses in the neighbourhood, one of the most vulnerable housing types. Similarly, efforts in the Downtown Eastside area of Vancouver have tried to retain the existing Single Room Occupancy (SRO) stock. An ongoing research project is looking at how preserve such a balance within an existing neighbourhood in West-Central Toronto (Centre for Urban and Community Studies).

5.7.5 Intervention in distressed neighbourhoods

European and American policies have focussed on the problem of public/social housing estates that over time became more homogeneous and problematic. Place-based strategies, such as the UK National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, brings key

public resources to address the needs of severely deprived neighbourhoods. While there appears to be some improvement in narrowing the gap between the areas that ranked highest on the Index of Multiple Deprivation and the nation, notably in employment, teen pregnancy and secondary school performance, other indicators such as crime, health and educational attainment of lower-achieving pupils has shown no improvement or a further decline (Berube 2005). It is suggested that the approach, which consists of improvement to social conditions by the government, is perhaps not sufficient for severely distressed neighbourhoods and that the cycle of decline is too far advanced to rely on the government acting as a catalyst to encourage market response and broader forces needed for regeneration. More striking and visible changes in social and physical features may be needed.

Canadian cities also experience segregation by income and ethnicity, however, to a lesser degree. In Toronto, the redevelopment of Regent Park is attempting to reduce segregation, disperse some lower income households and build diversity by attracting higher income households through ownership housing.

5.7.6 The limits of social mix

The physical proximity generated by social mix does not denote social inclusion:

> In any discussion of social mix, it is important to distinguish between physical and actual social integration. Physical integration exists when heterogeneous groups of people occupy adjacent physical space. This creates the potential for actual social integration. (Hulchanski 1990)

However this potential is not automatically realised. For example, a post occupancy evaluation of the False Creek in Vancouver concluded that the impact of social mix on residents of False Creek was limited and that is has not changed their lives (Vischer Skaburskis, Planners 1980).

Different results have been found in Europe where neighbourhood conflict rather than harmony has resulted from the mix of different cultures and ways of life (Blanc 1998) and exacerbation of differences and stereotypes (Dansereau et al. 2002). Similar results have been found in the US where too wide a gap between residents leads to exacerbation of tensions (Berube 2005). In the Netherlands social mobility has not been found to improve for lower income households in distressed neighbourhoods when households with higher incomes have moved in although in the UK, tenure mix, while not increasing social interaction, may improve the appearance and reputation of neighbourhoods (Cole and Goodchild 2000) and they may be less stigmatized (Berube 2005).

Another limitation of social mix policies expressed by the panel concerns the composition of the mix. The traditional view is one of class and tenure, but with the ever-changing variety of lifestyles, demographics and cultures in our cities, planning for a static social mix may not be as desirable.

While there appears to be strong evidence that social mix on a neighbourhood or small scale is at best insignificant or at worst counter-productive, there appears to be consensus in the literature and the panel discussion that social mix is desirable for social inclusion at the city level.

5.8 Process

The literature and panellists concur that spatial proximity does not lead to social inclusion, nor are the expected benefits of proximity realised in terms of social mobility (Dansereau et al. 2002; Cole and Goodchild 2000) and employment opportunities (Simon 2005; Oreopoulos 2005). Research also is unclear about the impact in terms of education (Simon 2005; Oreopoulos 2005; Berube 2005).

Instead, some focus on the importance of process in fostering inclusion in a dynamic and often multicultural environment. One suggestion is for the creation of "space" to negotiate and meet for true social inclusion. These "spaces" would appear to be political as well as grounded in the community around resources such as recreational associations and leisure activities. A key informant also emphasized the importance of process – especially at the level of political representation, citing the work of Siemiatycki and the representation of minority and cultural groups when decisions are made that have an impact on cities and neighbourhoods.

Panellists focused on process as well, suggesting that one way to promote social inclusion is through planning and negotiation that facilitates social transaction between people at any scale. This suggests that planned landscapes that don't work suffer from not enough diversity at the planning stage. However, it is recognized that public process is not easy or inexpensive, and can also marginalize population groups that do not or can not participate.

6. CONCLUSIONS

While the underlying goals of social inclusion are not new, the utility of the term may be its ability to re-examine issues of inequality, uneven access to resources and the impact of this.

In Canada, the idea of social inclusion may offer the potential to re-energize old debates, particularly in the context of the increasing diversity of our large metropolitan areas. It has been suggested that the idea of social inclusion sets higher expectations for change and reaches for more ambitious indicators. Combined with urban form, it further focuses on cities and their importance economically, politically, socially and culturally. It also highlights awareness of the importance of place and interest in the role of neighbourhoods.

The ability of cities to make room for the diversity, as illustrated by the process of establishing mosques in Toronto, or wider recognition of the contribution of immigrants, as illustrated by the East London work with the Bangladeshi community, may present one of the greatest challenges confronting urban places.

On the other hand, while there appears to be consensus that social inclusion is desirable, the knowledge of what this means in practice is less evident. There is little specific guidance that is available and accessible to practitioners, particularly at the municipal level where most land-use decisions are made.

The literature, key informants and panellists agree that mixed land use, public transportation, downtown public space, accessibility and social mix are aspects of urban form that influence and indeed may facilitate social inclusion. Open and inclusive political and planning processes at the local level may also help to facilitate or promote social inclusion, which is as much about process as it is about physical elements.

Mixed land use encourages porosity and accessibility. Public transportation helps to promote accessibility within the city and counteract undesirable isolation of certain groups. Shared downtown public space helps to promote identity within a city, and is important to civic life. Social mix appears to be essential at the city and metropolitan level, however, many of the successes have been achieved at the neighbourhood level with social housing programs. At the same time, the political and planning process that controls these decisions must be accessible and meaningful for a diversity of groups.

There is ample Canadian experience with social mix in housing, a cornerstone of past social housing policy. This study has revealed that social mix is an essential component of an inclusive city, but that physical proximity does not create social inclusion, rather at best it can facilitate it. Market forces naturally push towards uniformity or exclusion in residential development.

One of the few tools available to Canadian planners and policy makers to counteract these tendencies, and to achieve a mix of income levels, is social housing programs. Indeed when social housing programs have changed, social mix targets within projects or neighbourhoods have had to be reduced to reflect this.

It is clear that trends such as that in the old City of Toronto, where virtually the only remaining mixed income areas are those with a significant stock of social or public housing, are troubling to policy-makers, and undermine the ideal of an accessible and equal city. Other reasons evoked for social mix are pragmatic, such as a way to keep a diversity of workers in the city or retain certain groups, such as first-time homeowners, as illustrated in the City of Montréal Inclusion Strategy.

However, these initiatives revolve around critical role played by social housing programs in creating and maintaining social mix in the city. It is unclear whether the remaining tools and techniques such as inclusionary zoning, which rely on the private market to create affordable housing, can be as successful.

The study also underlines that social mix cannot be equated with social inclusion. The impact of social mix programs belies this. For example, it is not clear whether bringing households with higher incomes into “distressed” neighbourhoods or “deconcentrating” poverty, as being done in HOPE VI in the US, will lead to improvements or greater improvements than could have been accomplished by concentrating resources into these areas – especially given the cost of displacing existing residents. Furthermore research indicates that too great a difference or proximity can have the opposite effect and exacerbate tensions.

The idea of proximity may induce “cognitive flexibility”, as described by Granovetter, and maybe that in and of itself is a desirable goal. A population that is accepting of diversity may be sufficient to constitute social inclusion. While we have focussed primarily on housing mix, the role of public spaces and the growing privatization and resulting exclusionary nature are critical issues that merit consideration. The panel discussion confirmed that perhaps mix is not important at the micro-level, but more critical was mix at the city and regional level. Moreover, it may be more pragmatic and important to prevent communities from taking on a detrimental non-mix than pursuing some idealized vision of social mix. The literature, key informants and the panel discussion participants all point to the limits of mere proximity and underline that process and the creation of “space” to negotiate and meet as a truer expression of social inclusion. These “spaces” would appear to be political as well as grounded in the community around resources such as recreational associations, leisure activities, and the planning process itself.

7. FURTHER RESEARCH

This section describes knowledge gaps on the links between social inclusion and urban form and recommends three potential research projects to address these gaps. They are selected based on:

- Their relevance to objectives of this research;
- Identification of gaps and needs by key informants and panel discussion participants;
- Gaps identified in the literature;
- Ongoing or planned research that is identified below; and
- Research that would fall within CMHC's mandate.

It is important to point out that many research projects and initiatives currently underway or recently completed are very pertinent to the issue of social inclusion and urban form. To some extent they will potentially be expanding knowledge in related areas. These include:

- The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) Quality of Life Reporting System (QOLRS), which measures, monitors and reports on the quality of life in Canadian urban municipalities.[13]
- The Metropolis Project, an international forum for research and policy on migration and cities, based in four Canadian centres of excellence: Montréal, Toronto, Edmonton and Vancouver.
- Inclusive Cities Canada, a cross-Canada partnership of community leaders and elected municipal politicians working to enhance social inclusion.[14]
- The Centre for Urban and Community Studies at the University of Toronto which is undertaking a five-year study of Neighbourhood Change and Building Inclusive Communities from Within, consisting of a case study of Toronto's West-Central Neighbourhoods.
- A proposed international collaborative study on Social Mix and Neighbourhood Revitalisation that would look at policies and practices in Montréal, Paris, and Bristol led in Canada by the INRS-Urbanisation.

7.1 Excluded groups

A fundamental question in the context of any future research on the impact of urban form and social inclusion in a Canadian context is the issue of who is excluded.

This is especially important given the dynamic nature of our cities, and the fact that they are home to a large and growing concentration of immigrants. While many would agree that the homeless, immigrants and people of Aboriginal origin represent some of the most-excluded in our society, a related investigation might look at whether there are individuals or groups who experience exclusion that we do not normally think of as being excluded. For example:

[13] http://www.fcm.ca/english/qol/qol.html
[14] http://www.inclusivecities.ca/index.html

- Might way of life be the distinguishing characteristic, as opposed to tenure or class?
- In the panel discussion, it was asked whether older people, albeit with adequate financial resources, might feel excluded based on their age and abilities? Similarly youth.
- Today there are more people living alone, with different needs than families with children. Are they excluded in our family-oriented neighbourhoods? Once this subject is addressed, the question becomes how to design for diverse communities?

We need to know who is excluded in order to ensure that we create an urban form that facilitates inclusion of those groups. This might be accomplished using qualitative research methods such as focus groups or interviews.

7.2 Social mix

There was much debate in the published and grey literature, key informant interviews and among the panellists about the social mix concept, the appropriate scale, its role and effectiveness in promoting social inclusion and how to achieve it.

There also seems to be confusion around the terms social mix and social inclusion, with some tending to use the terms interchangeably. At the very least, social mix is viewed as a component of social inclusion. This would seem to be a central issue for Canadian housing policy-makers and planners, where the notion has been adopted and used for years, specifically in the context of social housing projects. Specific research questions might be:

- What do we hope to achieve with social mix?
- What is a desirable social mix, given the ever-changing diversity of our cities?
- Is social mix desirable at the social housing project level, neighbourhood level, at the city level?
- What are the best practises for achieving social mix at different scales?
- Some local governments are using inclusionary zoning and other tools to promote a social mix within new developments. Are these effective?
- Are federal and provincial social housing programs necessary?
- How can we maintain existing social mix, or promote it in existing neighbourhoods?
- What is the role of density in social mix?

Future studies might consider a forum on this subject, bringing together leading Canadian academics and practitioners to revisit this old concept in light of the research evidence.

7.3 Spatial policies for social inclusion

It was difficult for key informants and panellists to identify key physical attributes of an inclusive community and there is little literature in this area. It was much simpler to recognize the barriers inherent in an exclusive community.

The literature demonstrates a similar emphasis on physical manifestations of exclusion, although there is some evidence of the positive role of social mix, mixed land uses, public space and transportation. These are generally the purview of local planners and politicians. Both the dearth of published literature and the panel discussion point to a lack of clear direction regarding those urban forms and the elements of urban form that promote inclusion.

While mixed land use, access to public transportation, downtown public space and social mix were felt to be important, clear guidelines as to what these should look like or how they should perform are lacking. The idea of porosity was mentioned by key informants and during the panel discussion. If, in fact, small-scale social mix is not critical, but porosity, which includes access and openness, is, then it could be important to understand how porosity can be encouraged. Questions could include:

- What is a desirable mix of land uses?
- What are the best approaches for achieving it?
- At what scale?

Planners and practitioners need clear guidance on ways in which to minimize conflicts at the very least, and at best, to promote meaningful cohabitation. This could be achieved by a series of case studies, which are then analysed to develop best practices in terms of spatial policies for designing neighbourhoods, cities and regions, which promote social inclusion. It would need to address planning for new communities and existing communities and touch on the key components of land use mix, public space, transportation and social mix.

7.4 Other gaps

- In light of the increasing multicultural diversity of our cities, it would be helpful to learn from the experiences of other cities that have successfully managed this transformation. What are the lessons that can be learned about immigrant trajectories, urban form and inclusion in other cities around the world? How has urban form been used to promote inclusion and how successful have these efforts been?

- The symbolic nature of place and identity would seem to play an important role in fostering a common sense of belonging and inclusion. The work in Montréal neighbourhoods, as that of Belleville in Paris, illustrates the impact. A broader study that would examine perceptions of neighbourhoods and their image, especially what triggers these associations and knowledge, might result in elements that could be incorporated into design or practice. For example, it might be interesting to see whether the distinctive neighbourhood street signs, found in some cities (e.g. Toronto), play a role in providing a common sense of neighbourhood or serve a tourism purpose.

- Few, if any, large-scale urban developments that have included social objectives among their aims have been evaluated, and these have certainly not been examined through the lens of social inclusion. Monitoring and evaluation of

current and past projects that have social mix as an objective would be highly useful to further the understanding of the links between social inclusion and urban form. While projects such as Regent Park, the Woodwards redevelopment and Benny Farm will provide for a variety of household types and design features such as parks and common spaces to encourage exchanges, it would be useful to review these through the lens of social inclusion. The first step would be to define in practical terms what “social inclusion” represents (e.g. common identity, number and depth of social exchanges, etc.) and then test the level of success of these projects in meeting these goals. This research could produce some data or indicators linking the physical and social aspects of a community.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: A REVIEW OF THE EUROPEAN AND CANADIAN LITERATURE

Purpose and overview

The European and Canadian literature addressing the relationship between urban form and social inclusion is reviewed here.

The first part is a review of the European literature on the connections between, and learnings about, social exclusion/inclusion and urban form. The European literature is intended to form a backdrop to the Canadian literature.

Next is a synthesis of prevailing ideas on the presence of the relationship between urban form and social inclusion contained in the Canadian literature. Of particular interest are the pathways by which urban form influences social inclusion, for example, through transportation, density, housing and public space.

There is a significant disparity between the Canadian and European literature in terms of the dialogue on this subject. Because the term social inclusion/exclusion has its roots in Europe and is relatively recent in North America, it is still somewhat unknown or unused in the United States and few sources were found that use this term. In Canada, social inclusion is a fairly new concept in the literature, although the term has been more generally used in Quebec policy surrounding issues of poverty and social programs. With a few exceptions, an urban view is rarely taken to look at these issues.

In contrast, the European literature devotes much attention to the urban nature of social inclusion/exclusion, and the physical form it takes and the debate is at a different level, more conceptual and comparative. The academic literature teems with urban conceptualizations of social inclusion and it has some useful findings that will be of great interest to planners and policy makers, particularly in the areas of social mix, and cultural identity.

Scope and limitations

It should be noted that few published academic studies dealing with social inclusion and urban form in a Canadian context were located; the bulk of the material consisted of grey literature available through community and institutional sources. Key informant interviews and the panel discussion identified more grey literature, which has been incorporated into this review.

Relatively little American literature is included. The focus has been on the use of the concept of social exclusion/inclusion. In many respects these concepts stem from much broader and older ideas and theories in urban planning, such as spatial segregation, or in sociology, such as the “underclass”. To have broadened the terminology and included some of these concepts more systematically would have undoubtedly led to the addition of much more American literature. However, this would have made the scope of this review far beyond what was possible.

There has been an attempt to focus primarily on the spatial and urban manifestations of social exclusion, particularly how urban form influences social inclusion/exclusion. As discussed in Section 2 on definitions, the concept is large and vague. The understanding of the phenomenon and the policies undertaken to deal with it are very broad, and again, to do justice to all of them, the review would have necessitated examining the multiple dimensions of exclusion, including employment, education, social welfare measures, etc.

1. EUROPEAN LITERATURE

The review of the European literature on social exclusion/inclusion deals with the issue of urban form on four levels. The first level, for which there is an abundant literature, deals with the spatial impact of social polarisation, including the concept of social exclusion. A second body of literature examines neighbourhoods and the process of decline, while policies to encourage social inclusion and social mix are discussed in the fifth section. Finally, the issue of public spaces and more inclusive design are discussed in the fourth section.

1.1 The spatial impact of social exclusion

The issue of social inclusion, urban form, balance and mix is as old as industrialisation when social reformers began to address the problems associated with the presence of areas of deprivation side by side with areas of affluence. Means to deal with these disparities included public health measures in the nineteenth century and utopias created by visionaries such as George Cadbury with Bournville or Titus Salt with Saltaire, which sought to build communities in which different social-economic groups would live together. Some of these concerns were lost during subsequent periods; the Great Depression masked localized social and economic disparities, while the post-World War II period saw the rapid expansion of suburbs (Kirwan 1996) although the ideal of a “social balance” was retained in the New Town movement in Britain (Cole and Goodchild 2000).

The 1960s saw the re-emergence of concern about the “urban manifestations” of discrimination and neglect and, while these were primarily localized in the US, European countries, such as the UK and the Netherlands, saw their own emerging problems reflected in the American situation, although they were never confronted as vigorously as in the US (Kirwan 1996). Instead much of the emphasis in policy was narrowed down to the production of low-cost housing and issues such as “how people lived their lives” or relations with the city “receded to the background” (Healy 1998). Nonetheless, these issues were relatively ignored in Britain under Thatcher, when the concern about poverty was “effectively defined… out of existence while the northwest European states …believed that their highly developed social protection systems had ‘actually’ eradicated poverty” (Atkinson 2000). Furthermore, poverty was assumed to be “residual” and that it would not only disappear with “progress and growth” but that it was the result of “inappropriate forms of individual behaviour” (Atkinson 2000).

However the scale of social problems such as mass, long-term unemployment and homelessness that began to emerge in the late 1980s called for new approaches. These

changes, stemming from fundamental structural economic and social changes, include demographic shifts (e.g. the ageing of the population, transformations in household formation and typologies, etc.), globalization, and "the unwillingness of governments to expand public spending and borrowing" (Kirwan 1996). One consequence was that the local level grew more important – in part because of decentralisation of state functions to lower levels of government or an "implicit" shift due to the relevance of policies (Kazepov 2005).

Some of the concepts developed to understand the spatial impact of economic restructuring and globalization include the "polarisation thesis" whereby a "high-income stratum of workers" lives side-by-side to the "low-income stratum" of workers in gentrified areas that are deteriorated low-income areas (see Sassen 1991 for example). "Global cities"[15] are especially prone to this tendency as immigrants seeking better opportunities are attracted to these centres (Musterd et al. 1999). Changing labour needs are at the heart of the "mismatch theory" where those living in the inner city who "are too poorly educated to match the increasing qualification asked for by a post-industrial economy" experience a further or "double" mismatch – "they do not qualify in terms of education and they live far away from places where remnants of the industrial era still exist" (Musterd et al. 1999). Other concepts dealing more with the process include "disaffiliation" which is the process of "losing social ties and social relations through a combination of different events such as unemployment, family breakdown, homelessness, etc." (Blanc 1998)

Parallel to these concepts is the American notion of "underclass" which although first used in the 1960s, reappeared with the emergence of structural unemployment and the "rediscovery" of poverty in the US: the rise in unemployment and the failure of the welfare state led to speculation that an isolated section of society, outside the mainstream, was developing. The term underclass suggests not only poverty but also the intergenerational transmission of inadequacy and "hereditary psychological and pathological traits within the working class" (Murie 2005). The underclass, it is emphasised, is not only detached from the rest of society but "does not share the same culture or values" (Murie 2005). The concept of the underclass has not only been controversial and some of the key tenets, such as the intergenerational transmission of a culture of poverty and an analysis, which blames "the excluded" for their situation, have been challenged. Controversial as well is the idea that this type of poverty has been enabled by the welfare state (Cameron and Davoudi 1998). European researchers have noted key differences in the application of "underclass" to their own context, including more generous welfare states and lesser degrees of social and ethnic segregation (Murie 2005).

In general, European researchers would appear to conclude that, compared to the US, there is less spatial segregation in European cities (e.g. Kazepov 2005; Musterd and Ostendorf 2005). However, certain groups, such as immigrants, would seem to be worse off than nationals when European cities are examined (although it is not clear whether some cities are worse than others), but researchers also conclude that the "situation of American ghettos is probably incomparable to the situation of any neighbourhood in

[15] Sassen (2000) defines a Global City as a city that is playing a strategic role due to a combination of the global dispersal of economic activities and global interaction. They "concentrate control over vast resources, while finance and specialized services industries have restructured the urban and economic order" (Sassen 1991).

Europe" (van Kempen 2005). Some of this is due to European targeted-area based programs and a tighter social safety nets, notably welfare transfers (Murie 2005) and different welfare regimes (Musterd and Ostendorf 2005).

Other reasons include the continuing role of the public sector in planning and housing (Kazepov 2005) that has resulted in a "remarkable" share of public housing and land used for public functions (Häussermann and Haila 2005) resulting in a noticeably different urban form. The market is seen as much more dominant in the US where land use zoning and development controls "inadvertently" contributed to residential segregation, allowing the wealthy to distance themselves from the problems of the poor (Bartley 1998). Other differences include the American approach to slums and urban renewal, which displaced the poor. In Europe this was carried out differently and it "was never doubted that 'the city' as a whole should feel responsible for the living conditions of the people in inner-city areas" and that the process was never dictated by market interests (Häussermann and Haila 2005). Nonetheless for many researchers there is an assumption that the larger structural socio-economic and demographic changes are increasing inequality and that the increasing "inequality is assumed to activate processes of spatial segregation, which negatively influence opportunities for social mobility, particularly in socially and economically weak neighbourhoods" (Kazepov 2005).

New ways to understand "the apparent disintegration of societies" that seemed to be a result of social and economic changes were needed and terminology such as "social cohesion", "social solidarity" and "social inclusion" emerged (Atkinson 2000). The adoption of the concept of "social exclusion" by the European Commission in the mid-1980s led to "explicit" urban policies in the UK, France, and the Netherlands and adaptation of mainstream programs at the local level in countries such as Denmark (Atkinson 2000). The concept has dominated the European Union social discourse and has provided two useful elements: i) "the incidence of poverty and disadvantage among some groups and some locations" have been related to "wider processes of restructuring of economies and welfare states" and ii) the multiple nature of disadvantage has been emphasised and examined beyond the issues of income inequality (Cameron and Davoudi 1998). The use of the concept of social exclusion also resulted in a shift from a focus on distributional issues to relational ones: low income is not "a sufficient cause for being poor and issues of membership, access and belonging are also at stake" (Murie 2005).

The difference between the ubiquitous American notion of underclass, which seems to hold some appeal to Europeans, and the more common European concept of social exclusion is summarised as:

> The underclass concept emphasises the role and obligations of individuals and the way in which those obligations are negated by anti-social or economically dependent subcultures. In contrast, the concept of social exclusion emphasises the structural processes that prevent people from participating in 'mainstream' social life or that prevent access to employment, health and educational resources. (Cole and Goodchild 2000)

1.1.1 The European experience of social exclusion and housing policy

In many European cities, social, economic and policy changes are manifested in urban areas on large social housing estates, raising, if not illustrating, the issues of social

exclusion or “concentrated disadvantage” (Healey 1998). In France, for example, the “grand ensembles” had been built for skilled working-class and lower middle-class residents but these more affluent groups moved into the owner-occupied sector and the estates were left to those who could not buy – immigrants, single parent families, young households and those with low prospects for stable employment (Murie 2005).

A similar phenomenon occurred in Denmark, where a “slummification” process began with the departure of many nuclear families from housing estates in the 1970s, leaving behind tenants “receiving assistance from social services, or were retired, immigrants or suffering long-term unemployment”. The situation in these estates deteriorated, with the fear of “violence, vandalism and burglary” becoming “part of daily life” (Vestergaard 1998).

In the UK similar trends due to social, economic and demographic changes were occurring, but these were further activated by the policy of right-to-buy of council housing during the Thatcher years (Lupton and Power 1998). Council housing became “residualised” as the households that could afford it bought their units and the existing stock came under greater pressure as “often those in the highest need could access it” (Lupton and Power 1998). This resulted in the “hollowing out” of the age structure with younger households, with low employment levels (Lee and Murie 1999) while new tenants were likely to be economically inactive, have dependent children and be headed by someone from a “manual work social class background” (Burrows 1997). As elsewhere, the image of the social housing stock changed and became less attractive, becoming “predominantly a tenure of the poor” (Lupton and Power 1998). This “narrowing of the income and social profile of households in the social housing sector” led to “increasing correspondence between economic vulnerability and place, with an ever wider geographical expression of the growing gulf between the ‘contented’ majority…and the marginalized minority” (Cole and Goodchild 2000).

1.1.2 Exclusion, employment, and disparity

Because the concept of social exclusion is large and not very precise (see the Section 2 on definitions) some of the research and policy work has focussed primarily on integration through paid employment, noting that one of the defining characteristics of the “excluded” is that they have no jobs:

> People may become socially excluded because they do not participate in the labor market and so cannot raise sufficient income to actively participate in society. They also miss out on direct interactions with colleagues. It is assumed that the socio-spatial composition of the population is a relevant factor in this respect. (Musterd & Ostendorf 2005)

The concept of social exclusion, echoing that of the underclass, also can be used to “imply that some people and some neighbourhoods are drifting away from the norms of society as a whole” and that policy action should focus on “bringing them back”, although often “such governance action itself encourages the drift” (Healey 1998).

Considerable work has been undertaken by European researchers to compare cities and welfare regimes and the underlying forces that lead to social exclusion (see URBEX: The Spatial Dimensions of Urban Social Exclusion and Integration: A European

Comparison[16] for example). Comparison of the occurrence of social exclusion between different cities has generally concluded that the larger the disparity in a society, the greater the spatial manifestation. Thus "social inequality tends to be reflected spatially and when social inequality is large, socio-spatial inequality will be large as well" (Musterd et al. 1999). American research "suggests that spatial segregation of two social groups increases with the degree of income inequality in a city, the degree of inequality of education (years of schooling in a city), the percentage of minorities in the total urban population, and the size of the total population in the city" (Murie 2005).

1.2 Neighbourhood studies and the process of decline

Some of the work on social exclusion has focussed on the neighbourhood level; how certain neighbourhoods can become excluded and how social cohesion occurs or can be encouraged. Some of these issues can be related directly to urban form and design. For example, analysis of a disadvantaged area in a new town, North Clondalkin, outside of Dublin in Ireland, found it to be not only isolated but also "invisible to residents of more prosperous parts of the city" (Bartley 1998). North Clondalkin, which includes both public housing estates and some private estates, is described as having "littered and unkempt approach roads, run-down neighbourhood centres…poorly kept open spaces…and housing estates which face inward and turn their back on the public areas". When the neighbourhood is featured in the wider media, "it is usually as the result of some major law and order disturbances" (Bartley 1998).

The design of the area is one of the reasons for its isolation. The roads were designed to cater to households with cars, yet the level of car ownership is much lower than average. Furthermore, the sprawling, cul-de-sac style is the "worst possible operating environment for urban bus services" further isolating the residents. The difference between public and private housing is visually evident, with the areas with the most concentrated levels of public housing and the furthermost from the centre "showing the greatest evidence of degradation and neglect". Thus the social and economic circumstances of many of the residents of the neighbourhood (e.g. high unemployment levels and low incomes) as well as the isolated location and internal design "combine to entrap many local residents". The design features also "serve to keep outsiders away" as is its reputation (Bartley 1998).

The description of North Clondalkin illustrates many of the characteristics and processes that underlie the urban face of social exclusion. Some of these tie into theories of "disorder" and "broken windows" whereby "social incivilities" such as broken windows, drinking on the street, or graffiti would attract potential offenders since they would assume that residents are indifferent to what happens in the neighbourhood (see Wilson and Kelling 1982 and Skogan 1990 for example). The process is one that also relies on perception. These perceptions can go as far as excluding neighbourhoods from insurance coverage for homes if areas are seen as high crime or persons seeking work or credit, may find that their address is a disadvantage (Gilroy and Speak 1998).

Once a neighbourhood has become a location of "last choice" it then begins to attract two kinds of households: "households with problems" and "problem households". The

[16] A multidisciplinary European research project focusing on spatial patterns of exclusion. www2.fmg.uva.n/urbex.

first type will need help and support and may create extra demands on services and not be able to contribute to community resources, while the second type will create problems for others through deliberate acts, such as crime or noise (Lupton and Power 2002). Costs for public services such as health and education could increase (Dansereau et al. 2002). The concentration of disadvantaged households can set off a downward spiral whereby households with limited access to jobs, income and choice in the housing market, leads to "a lack of political clout, no market to attract quality goods and services, overstretched public services, the stereotypes that reinforce isolation and lack of access to jobs, and capital, poor health, low self-esteem and crime" (Murie 2005). People become "locked into communities labelled as market failures and locked out of opportunities to lever themselves into situations more conducive to human flourishing" (Gilroy and Speak 1998).

A similar downward spiral was described in Danish housing estates, where once the more affluent residents left, not only did social problems increase, but the financial problems due to the departure of tenants, meant that there were "fewer resources for cleaning and maintenance as well as for organising tenant-based work and social activities". The physical decline decreases the attractiveness of the estates, making it difficult to draw better-off tenants, and intensifying social problems through "selective turnover". Furthermore, the need for greater expenditure on maintenance puts more pressure on the financial and organisational resources of management, which can lead to poorly organised maintenance and management, again further increasing social problems (Vestergaard 1998).

Neighbourhoods will then have an impact on their residents in three ways: intrinsic and well-established characteristics (e.g. location, transportation infrastructure, housing, economic base, etc.); residential sorting either through the private market or public policy that will concentrate "the most disadvantaged people in the least advantaged neighbourhoods; and, once the disadvantage is established, more disadvantages may be acquired (e.g. reputation, environment, services), further limiting the opportunities to residents (Lupton and Power 2002). Berube (2005) in reviewing studies of neighbourhood effects finds that concentrations of poverty result in private sector activity, limit job networks and employment ambitions, stimulate higher levels of crime and disorder, exacerbate health inequalities, and have an impact on educational attainment. In the latter case, one study reviewed by Berube found that the intake characteristics and neighbourhood wealth have a greater impact on the probability of primary school success than teacher qualifications and expenditures per pupil.

Based on research of twelve "poverty wards" in England, the process and the different aspects of social exclusion are summarised in the table below. It should be noted that these categories of characteristics are interdependent – for example: high levels of disorder may lead to a sense of lack of control over the environment, increased mistrust of other residents and diminished community spirit (Lupton and Power 2002).

Negative acquired characteristics of poor neighbourhoods

Physical environment	Private-sector services	Public-sector services	Sense of power, control, and inclusion	Social organization	Social order
Empty housing and shops Damage to empty buildings Litter Dumped household rubbish and goods Dumped cars Used needles Burglary Vandalized bus shelters and lights Overgrown hedges and verges Broken fences Graffiti	No bank Few shops High shop prices 'No-go' area for taxis and newspaper delivery	Failing schools Poor standard of housing and repairs Ineffective environnemental services	Sense of area decline Mistrust of public-service providers Feeling of inferiority vis-à-vis professionals Low take-up rates Sense of being 'no good' because of bad reputation of area High levels of mental ill-health More dependence	Reduced social networks Isolation Divided community Mistrust of neighbours	High crime Noise Speeding cars/bikes Neighbour intimidation and aggression Drug dealing High levels of truancy and exclusion Unsupervised children and youth nuisance Stray dogs

From Lupton and Power 2002 p. 134

1.2.1 Access to services

North Clondalkin illustrates how households become trapped in their neighbourhoods, which will have an impact on access to services. "Households living in areas with limited resources are likely to be disproportionately dependent of local facilities – shops, schools, health services, transport services, jobs, and training…Yet, these are areas that tend to be deprived in terms of the key local services" (Murie 2005). Thus the perception of "no go" areas will be used by "banks, insurance companies, the police and social services, but their spatial demarcations become more visible only through practices such as the withdrawal of financial services from 'high risk' localities… many service providers are guilty of withdrawal…of imposing different entry rules for residents of some areas… and of using the plethora of postally coded information to target their services to carefully chose lifestyle and location groups" (Gilroy and Speak 1998).

The table above differentiates between access to public and private services: the impact of the private sector on excluded neighbourhoods is illustrated in UK research on food deserts. Access to healthy, nutritious and cheap food has been seen as growing more difficult in the UK as "intense food superstore development on edge-of-city sites was seen as having unevenly stripped food retailing out of parts of those cities" (Wrigley et al. 2002). Thus healthy and cheap food was "virtually unobtainable" in food deserts. "Car-less residents, unable to reach out-of-town supermarkets, depend on the corner shop where prices are high, products are processed and fresh fruit and vegetables are poor or non-existent" (Wrigley 2002). Policy responses to this in the UK have included increasingly restrictive planning permission to build large out-of-centre stores and the encouragement, and subsequent interest on the part of retailers to take over deteriorating retail centres that had been situated in many estates (Wrigley et al. 2002).

Research indicates that access to public or "decommodified" services, such as housing and school, is spatially determined as well. Two forces that reinforce each other are proposed as explanations for this. The first is that areas with poor services are likely to be considered as the "last resort" by those who have a choice. Furthermore these areas are likely to have a higher degree of population turnover, which will affect "the extent to which social cohesion and community develops" as well as "the extent to which social programs can be effectively targeted": improvement to employability, education and training, is very difficult with a highly mobile population (Murie 2005).

1.3 Policies to deal with social exclusion/increase social inclusion

The complexity of the issue of exclusion and its relation with urban form requires that understanding of the issue be based on a range of "different deprivations" and processes, further implying that the focus is not only on those who are excluded, but also the "agencies and individuals that 'do the excluding'" (Murie 2005). For example, in Britain, social exclusion is not only the result of fundamental structural changes but also the result of policy (central government as well as the local level and *quangos*[17]), which have pushed people into particular neighbourhoods. These policies include social benefits, housing allocation and economic policy (Healey 1998). There also have been negative impacts from place-based policies in the UK; the retargeting and restructuring of government agencies has resulted in fragmentation of links between clients and agencies as well as competition between agencies. "This produces micropolitics of exclusion and inclusion and adds to the fragmenting of place-based relationships, including those within neighbourhoods" (Healey 1998).

One of the lessons from developing social exclusion policy is that factors other than income must be taken into account, as well as the recognition that "households at different stages in their lives and in different circumstances are affected by different processes of exclusion and experience social exclusion to different extents and in different ways" (Murie 2005). Uni-dimensional approaches, such as renovating physical surroundings, may result in some positive impacts but will not substantially improve social conditions. Instead the social conditions themselves must be addressed and policies need to include multiple actors and close collaboration (Vestergaard 1998).

[17] A quango is a *quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisation*, nominally independent but relies on government funding.

One proposed approach that takes the multiple aspects of social exclusion into account is one with a focus on what it means to live in a place. The multiplicity of roles that people play and the services they use throughout the day permits an understanding of how "they think about, use and value their living spaces" (Healey 1998). This approach gets away from a purely economic view of neighbourhoods and a policy approach that concerns itself with separate areas of service delivery such as health, education, training and employment (Healey 1998). The approach emphasises the neighbourhood, while recognising that for some "space has little meaning" (especially if they move from one place to another by car). For others "their whole year is spent in and around a particular place" and "this becomes a living place, an active neighbourhood, as people come to use, enjoy and identify with its qualities and develop interactions with others…In some neighbourhoods, the defining characteristics are the sense of neighbourliness and community as people greet each other, help each other out and work together on neighbourhood activities. These being to develop some of the qualities which are implied in the concept of social cohesion…" (Healey 1998).

1.4 Social mix

1.4.1 Policies to encourage mix

The debate on spatial segregation usually is focussed on socio-economic or ethnic differences. Other separation does exist and is not necessarily considered as problematic, such as "lifestyle-related neighbourhoods: neighbourhoods appealing to the young or the childless, to family households, careerists, etc." (Musterd and Ostendorf 2005). Some of this is by choice, since many households look for "socially homogeneous residential environments" (Musterd et al. 1999).

The perception of strength in homogeneity begins to approximate that of the place-based community or *gemeinschaft*, where networks are "densely concentrated among a group of people who shared a common life and living space" and where identities and relations with others are constructed. It is proposed, however, that this place-based ideal is no longer possible since "many people live in several networks at once" and while social networks may intersect, this might not necessarily be in residential neighbourhoods (Healey 1998).

Thus the concentration of ethnic groups or even poverty is not necessarily negative: for example these communities could also be seen as resilient and the segregation can have "a positive function, increasing security and avoiding contact with the dominant groups" (Murie 2005). This may be especially true in the protection of ethnic cultures from the dominant cultures (Murie 2005) or "allow particular people and groups to flourish in protected environments" (Healey 1998). It has been suggested that the priority of promoting stable communities, by developing a sense of community, solidarity among residents to make them help each other and to "co-operate in controlling anti-social behaviour" should perhaps take precedence over the 'risk' of homogeneity (Cole and Goodchild 2000). The acknowledgement that homogeneity per se is not all negative is more dynamic formulation of the issue. The impact of neighbourhoods is not simply of neighbourhoods on residents but there is room for "a two-way interaction in which residents shape the neighbourhood and the character of the neighbourhood affects decisions to stay, move to, an move on from the neighbourhood" (Murie 2005).

1.4.2 The experience of social mix policies

Older evaluations of British social balance policies from the 1940s and 1950s found that not only did mixing different social and economic groups not promote social interaction, but it may have led to disputes between neighbours. The studies found that people preferred having neighbours of a similar background, and that "more intensive neighbouring is likely in streets and estates characterized by a degrees of social homogeneity, or similar in their social background, rather than diversity" (Cole and Goodchild 2000). The policies of that era as well, it is pointed out, were not extended to "the rich – who continued to live in their own (as yet ungated) enclaves" (Cole and Goodchild 2000).

The flip side of the spatial separation discussion is that of spatial proximity, and by implication, social mix and social cohesion. The research would seem to generally indicate that proximity per se does not lead to inclusion and inclusion would seem to be especially elusive if the proximity has been forced. Thus when "communities with differing cultures and ways of life reside in the same area, by constraint and not by choice, neighbourhood conflict is more likely than inter-community harmony" (Blanc 1998). Research in France on the *grands ensembles* has also found that "captive" residents, with little choice and households on a downward trajectory had the most difficulty accepting a social mix (Dansereau et al. 2002). Too much difference in socio-professional status is also more likely to lead to tension (Dansereau et al. 2002).

One example of moving people out of a neighbourhood is the American Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program that has operated in five large cities (Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles and New York) in which low-income, deprived households were moved into affluent neighbourhoods by using housing vouchers. Evaluations have found that there has been no impact on the employment or educational outcomes of the people moved out. The results of the program confirm "what major urban sociology surveys have already stated: spatial proximity does not necessarily help to reduce social distance… On the contrary, common residence in a single space tends to foster differentiation strategies among residents that tend to hamper cooperation, raising controversial questions about the advantages of social mixing" (Simon 2005). Studies also have found that people with housing vouchers have had difficulty finding housing in middle-income neighbourhoods and that when compared to other households with housing vouchers, but not restricted to certain neighbourhoods, there was no great difference in outcomes, including mental or physical health of adults, academic success or problems with behaviour of youth. One explanation has been that the differences were too great between the social groups and that the new environment did not encourage social interaction and the development of role models (Dansereau et al. 2002).

More frequent are policies that target increasing social mix within poor and excluded neighbourhoods. Policies can revolve around the social housing sector. For example, "diffusion" policies, most explicitly used in Frankfurt (*Frankfurther Vertrag*), provide quotas for housing allocation. Projects must achieve a distribution of 30% non-Germans, 10% *Aussiedler* (ethnic Germans), and 15% recipients of social benefits. This type of policy has come under heavy attack in the UK and the Netherlands, while in Germany and Sweden, where these are still used, the "reluctance of the population… to cooperate has undermined the philosophy of mixing the population". Furthermore, new immigrants

have been excluded from social housing in sections of Frankfurt where the 30% quota had been reached (Musterd et al. 1999).

More comprehensive policies have been undertaken in the UK (Urban Development Policy), in the Netherlands (*Stedelijke Herstructurering* or Urban Restructuring), as well as in France (*Politique de la Ville et Développement Social des Quartiers* or City Policy and Neighbourhood Social Improvement), which link urban development and economic insertion (Kirwan 1996). The strategies target social mixing either through "settlement policies where authorities have some control over public housing, or through a variety of incentives where the housing structure is private" (Simon 2005). Infrastructure and amenities as well as the quality of life are improved to make them more appealing and "fight the adverse effects (or at least perceived as such) of the concentration of poverty" (Simon 2005). However, a review of projects that sought to mix tenures in the UK found that "there is little social interaction between people of different tenure background" and that the introduction of owner-occupation has not led to 'bridging' within the community, but it may have helped external links with the wider neighbourhood, "including improving the 'external' reputation and appearance of the area" (Dansereau et al. 2002). A similar conclusion is drawn from the Netherlands where moving higher income households into distressed neighbourhoods has not had any significant impact on social mobility (Dansereau et al. 2002).

It should be noted that similar policies are being undertaken in the US. For example, the HOPE VI program that has identified 86,000 units or 6% of the public housing stock as "severely distressed". Over ten years, the program has intervened in 166 cities and funded the demolition and redevelopment of 80,000 units. While the data would indicate increases in median incomes and labour force participation, declines in crime, school improvement and increased sale prices of homes, the program is highly controversial because it does not guarantee displaced residents a right to return (only about 46% are expected to return to the redeveloped sites) (Berube 2005). Furthermore, it is not clear how meaningful these results are given that they may only reflect the new composition of residents rather than any improvement in the situation of households living in distressed areas. Nonetheless, most studies seem to indicate that relocated households are satisfied with their housing (Berube 2005).

One of the potential consequences of policies that bring a mix into existing neighbourhoods, however, is the displacement of original residents, or gentrification. An example where the displacement did not follow the influx of higher income households is in the neighbourhood of Belleville in Paris. The arrival of "multiculturals" or "marginal gentrifiers", who are characterized by their acceptance and appreciation of social and ethnic mix, were also willing to accept a neighbourhood's social order and were able to co-exist with the local population. One of the ways this was done was to create a "Belleville myth", thereby creating a "common area, open to all". This myth was based on two assertions: the area was an old working-class neighbourhood and it had been settled by immigrants a long time ago (in spite of the fact that their arrival had been more recent). By inserting the immigrants into the "neighbourhood's collective memory" this population was seen as having an equal right to the neighbourhood. By having the newcomers accept the myth of the neighbourhood as working class, there was then room for them to all come together to fight a proposed renovation program for the area, and in the process "reaffirmed local identity" (Simon 2005).

These results echo findings from other studies; when “communities with differing cultures and ways of life reside in the same area, by constraint and not by choice, neighbourhood conflict is more likely than inter-community harmony” (Blanc 1998). For example, studies have found that great social distance and close physical proximity can exacerbate differences and stereotypes and result in further marginalisation and exclusion (Dansereau et al. 2002). Research in the US has shown that a wide gap between subsidised and market housing exacerbates tensions in new developments (Berube 2005) while too much difference in socio-professional status is also more likely to lead to tension (Dansereau et al. 2002). In France, studies of the *grands ensembles* have revealed that “captive” residents, with little choice and households on a downward trajectory, had the most difficulty accepting a social mix (Berube 2005).

1.4.3 Community development and government partnerships

One of the elements of the fundamental structural changes has been the growing importance of the local level and the unwillingness of governments to increase public spending. At the community level, this can mean that new partnerships, often through a third sector agency, are asked to undertake greater governance roles (e.g. tenant management or community development) as these roles are “sloughed off by government” (Healey 1998).

An example was the approach used in the UK that having residents undertake community development work would lead to permanent and stable employment. These place-based initiatives were time-limited, drew in private sector involvement, self-help and were based on partnerships through which most targeted urban subsidies were delivered. While control and empowerment were emphasised, a “whole range of substantial and complex tasks were being offloaded on the most needy and vulnerable”, while grassroots organisations were squeezed out because of a lack of resources undermined by the other pressure they face as a result of political and economic restructuring” (Healey 1998).

A further concern about this kind of approach is whether they generate “enduring cohesion”, since they are often “ephemeral, a sort of lurching gravy train which halts for a while in a place and then moves on”. Unless these initiatives are generated from within the community or “extremely sensitive to the dynamics of local social relations” they will not take existing “relational resources and forms of collective management” into account, which is “typically informal and centred on the world of family and neighbours”. The result can then be that instead of “building more cohesive relationships around people’s living place, the gravy train could render them more unstable” (Healey 1998).

1.4.4 Why social mix and inclusion

In spite of various attempts at place-based policies, the general tendency in Europe would seem to be general, non area-specific policies: “the aim is to reach as many poor (i.e. potentially socially excluded) people as possible, irrespective of where they live”. Underlying this approach is the view that since the processes leading to spatial segregation, such as economic restructuring, are taking place throughout society, the remedy will come from society as a whole (Musterd et al. 1999). The experience with area-specific policies also would appear to be mixed, due in part to “poor specificity of objectives and effective integration with wider strategies”. Furthermore, the causes and the means to resolve multiple deprivations “remain speculative” (Mangen 2004).

Examples include the “intransigence” of social exclusion even in “booming cities” and in contexts where overall inequality is decreasing: area-targeting is then “more a political than a technical decision” (Mangen 2004). Finally, it is also questioned whether “targeting deprived areas is an effective way of targeting deprived individuals” and the response is “‘no’, given the large number of deprived people living in non-deprived areas” (Buck 2001).

Nonetheless, area-specific policies to encourage social inclusion and social mix continue to be proposed. Thus a ‘balanced’ community “implicitly suggests a degree of positive social interaction and a degree of social cohesion” (Cole and Goodchild 2000). Given that the result of social mixing is at best questionable, one then has to look at the rationale behind this ongoing concern.

Berube (2005) suggests three major reasons why governments may want to promote mixed communities: to avoid creating or perhaps eradicating concentrations of deprivation (although it could be argued that concentration would allow better delivery of services in efficient manner); greater success in delivering key public service outcomes such as crime and education can be achieved; and mixed communities are more sustainable avoiding the cycle of decline and massive regeneration that would be required or, at the other extreme, the limitation of options for low-income households with gentrification.

Other explanations include:

- Epidemic models: Behaviour is assumed to be contagious, especially the power of peer influences to “spread problem behaviour” while the alternative is “collective socialization” where “successful adults” in neighbourhood can provide role-models and monitoring (Buck 2001) This epidemic model is similar to a “paternalistic” approach that suggests that underprivileged households will learn from upper income households. The lessons will range from better hygiene; education of children, as well as ways to improve their situation, through learning how to save, deferred gratification, and eventually become socially mobile (Dansereau et al. 2002)

- Social capital: Social segregation is linked to a lack of job opportunities and balanced communities are “more likely to create informal social contacts, and the ‘get-work networks’ that help ensure unemployed people find work” (Cole and Goodchild 2000). Some of this is related to the concept of social capital, which consists of “networks and norms that enable participants to act together effectively to pursue shared objectives”. A distinction is made between “bonding capital” which occurs among people who know each other (e.g. community support) and “bridging capital” between people or groups who did not know each other previously. This latter type of social capital links into institutional infrastructure and the larger city, the theory being that “a more diverse mix will both deepen and widen social interaction in a positive way” (Cole and Goodchild 2000). An examination of projects that sought to mix tenures in the UK found that, while “there is little social interaction between people of different tenure background”, the introduction of owner-occupation “has not led to ‘bridging’ within the community”. It may however, have “helped external links with the wider neighbourhood” including improving the “external” reputation and appearance of the area (Cole and Goodchild 2000).

- Perception and reputation: The experience of mixing tenures in the UK has found "some evidence that more socially mixed neighbourhoods are likely to be less stigmatised by outsiders, but it is difficult to identify clear practical benefits for households living in the type of mixed tenure estates that have been developed in Britain" (Cole and Goodchild 2000). Segregation at the street level was maintained, with owner occupants in one part of an estate and renters elsewhere (Cole and Goodchild 2000).

- Democracy: Proximity and social mix will allow people to accept their differences, to learn to tolerate each other and dissolve prejudices. The process of dialogue and exchange of ideas and differing visions of the world is seen as fundamental to pluralism and democracy (Dansereau et al. 2002).

- Visibility: One of the results of social exclusion is "to make less visible the social exclusion experience by the isolated and fragmented communities of the area and to obscure from general view the specific problems of its inhabitants" (Bartley 1998). Furthermore marginal populations may have no formal political visibility, either debarred from representation or with no route to exercise a political voice, and they may also be deemed not to exist such as illegal immigrants or homeless persons (Stewart and Griffiths 1998). Mixing the various groups would make the excluded populations more visible, and perhaps, give them a stronger political voice.

1.4.5 The limits of social mix

The concept of social exclusion, it has been proposed, was particularly resonant in countries where social cohesion and solidarity are deemed essential to the social contract that forms the basis of the society. The idea of social cohesion implies shared values as well as "place attachment" and "intertwining" of personal and place identity, social order and social control, and social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities.

Amin (2002) suggests that there is an emerging consensus for a need for "daily negotiation of difference where people can come to terms with ethnic difference and where the voicing of racism can be muted." However, neither mixed housing nor public spaces, which are ideally viewed as offering sites for such encounters, can play this role for they are not spaces of "inter-dependence and habitual engagement." For example, it is suggested that little contact between strangers occur in public spaces and that they tend to be territorialized by particular groups.

Instead better sites are "micro-publics" where dialogue and negotiations are compulsory such as workplaces, schools, youth centres and spaces of association. It is suggested that habitual contact not only doesn't guarantee cultural exchange, but also can instead entrench group animosities and identities. Instead spaces outside of the daily environment can act as sites of "banal transgressions" where "engagement with strangers in a common activity disrupts easy labelling of the stranger as enemy and initiates new attachments." Added to this complexity is that there is no formula for these interactions, but instead they are meaningful only in the "context of situated dynamics" but suggestions for sites of banal transgressions can include community gardens or other ventures run by residents and community organisations.

1.5 Public spaces

Social exclusion is considered to be multidimensional and three broad spheres of social life are usually considered: economic (i.e. the access to resources usually through employment); political (i.e. participation in decision-making); and cultural (i.e. to share a set of symbols and meanings). This last category, which has historically included language, religion, and nationality also can include cultural life and symbolic relationships in the ways that individual and group identities are formed (Madanipour 1998).

Therefore, beyond the inclusion and exclusion of neighbourhoods and where people live, there is also the potential exclusion or inclusion that can occur on a city wide level, especially in public spaces. This space is "the common ground where people carry out the functional and ritual activities that bind a community…" and "public space is space we share with strangers, people who aren't our relatives, friends, or work associates. It is space for politics, religion, commerce, sport; space for peaceful coexistence and impersonal encounter" (Madanipour 1998). To many writers such as Jane Jacobs, successful urban places are based "predominantly on street life, and the various ways in which activity occurs in and through buildings and spaces" (Montgomery 1998). It is suggested that good urban spaces are based on three qualities: activity (the product of vitality, related to numbers of people as well as activity around the clock, and diversity, which stems from differences in taste and proclivities); image (which includes comprehension and understanding of places including a city's legibility and access); and form (which includes a sense of place and safety, allowing the maximum scope for activity). One of the essential components is the public realm and the need for public and semi-public spaces, such as market squares, sidewalk cafés, and shop frontages (Montgomery 1998).

However, one of the changes that has been observed and well documented is the increasing privatization of public spaces. When large-scale developers and financiers invest in properties they expect "their commodities to be safe for investment and maintenance" and search to reduce levels of uncertainty (Madanipour 1998). Parallel to this is the fear of crime and the expectations of consumers that lead to "totally managed environments" which can range from gated communities to shopping malls (Madanipour 1998). These privatised public spaces use a range of means, including architectural design and private security, to "inculcate 'acceptable' patterns of behaviour" but that also "conceal a brutalizing demarcation of winners and losers, included and excluded". These are in fact the "geographical expression of the erosion of Keynsian ideals of full employment, integrated welfare entitlement and 'social citizenship'" (MacLeod 2002). The privatised malls have been called "urbanoid" spaces: "Here a fusion of consumption, entertainment and popular culture have promoted a privatised sense of city living with what appears to look like the traditional street but is devoid of the diversity that it used to support" (Atkinson 2003)

However, public spaces do not need to be privatised to be exclusionary. In the UK some of the high streets have proven to be exclusionary by virtue of the shops that are located there. For example, the "city centre of Newcastle is a place of conspicuous, some might say gross, consumption. The impact of this is that it is rare to see anyone there who looks poor. Discussions with poor people on council estates reveal a sense of shame at their shabbiness and a feeling of being literally out of place among the smart shops an the well dressed people who frequent them… the boundaries between the consuming

and nonconsuming public are being strengthened with nonconsumption being constructed as a form of deviance" (Gilroy and Speak 1998). This non-consumption as deviance flows into concepts of citizenship as well, it is suggested: "The rights conferred by citizenship are increasingly predicated on being a consumer - consumers of private and government services" (Atkinson 2003). Design features also can be used in public spaces to exclude. An example is "bum-proof" park benches that have armrests so that people, especially homeless people, cannot lie down on them, "thus 'designing-out' the already socially excluded" (Atkinson 2003).

The arrival of upscale business can also lead to exclusionary practices, if not "vengeful" public policy (Atkinson 2003). In Glasgow, the Buchanan Galleries, a shopping centre in the downtown, is situated across from the George Hotel that housed many homeless people, especially middle-aged men. When the shopping centre was opened, the media began to express concern that "beggars were scaring away city centre shoppers" and a discourse of crime and insecurity and its impact on business was introduced (MacLeod 2002). This reaction is not unusual; research would indicate that homeless people have been especially targeted in downtown areas, including restrictions on selling homeless magazines such as the "Big Issue", and moving on if not arresting panhandlers (MacLeod 2002).

A similar process has been described in New York revitalisation with the example of Bryant Park that was "improved through expanding its consumption uses and expectations of behaviour through better maintenance and surveillance by guards" (Atkinson 2003). It is suggested that new spaces often have "subtle codes ...while having no policy of exclusion ...which the disadvantaged might not enter simply through feeling uncomfortable in such a place. In this sense, more subtle modes of exclusion are woven into much deeper class and cultural interpretations of whom a place is 'for'" (Atkinson 2003).

The impact of class and cultural interpretations of space has been addressed in the UK through the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. The document *People and Places: Social Inclusion Policy for the Built and Historic Environment* (2002) recognises that the built environment is the "visible manifestation of society's inherited values" and can "connect people to their culture". The policy paper proposes that new developments should involve an inclusive process of community outreach and engagement that is a "long-term process, not a one-off". The issue of historic environment is addressed since: "Whether people feel 'at home' with a place can affect how socially included they feel in society". Some of this includes issues such as physical accessibility, but also the acknowledgement of "hidden histories that tell the diverse social, economic and cultural stories of a place" for they can "engage more people than representation of exclusive and wealthy lifestyles" (Department for Culture, Media and Sport 2002)

This issue is illustrated in a study of the Bangladeshi community in East London (Gard'ner 2004). The Bangladeshi community is the largest ethnic group in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets after the indigenous white community (22.9% of the population of the borough and 61% of one ward within it) and dates back to the 1960s when seamen came to the docks of the East End and opted to stay. The study consisted of identifying sites that were important to this population by interviewing members and leaders of the community and those working in regeneration agencies. A visual survey of the sites and comparing these against "official" identification and protection by heritage agencies followed. Difference between what the community identified as significant and

what warrants statutory recognition emerged. For example, two mosques were “almost universally identified as the building of greatest significance to the Bengalee community” yet one of them, having been built in the mid-1990s precludes it from statutory listing in spite of having “special social importance due to its having been financed by, and purpose-built for, the local Muslim community. It is a physical expression of faith, utilising as it does Islamic architectural features” yet this building “would be unlikely to meet the current criteria, as defined by the Secretary of State, to be considered worth of statutory listing in the future due primarily to its lack of architectural or aesthetic merit” (Gard’ner 2004). Other buildings, deemed important by the community such as a community centre, again would not merit recognition because they are not old enough or considered to have sufficient architectural or historical merit. However, for some buildings “it is the characteristics that made them available and affordable by the Bengalee community that would preclude them from statutory protection” (Gard’ner 2004).

Other places that are of importance to the community include small-scale clothing factories (“they are seen ass an important part of the social history of the area, providing employment for new arrivals and, more recently, business opportunities for the more establish community”); local markets that cater to their own community (one of which is the “only public market where Muslim Bengalee women will shop without their husbands, which leads directly to its importance as a site of social interaction as well as commercial activity”); and a park which was renamed in 1998 after a machinist who was murdered during a racially motivated attack and who “can be seen as a martyr to the cause of the right of the Bengalee people to live in Britain without fear of persecution” (Gard’ner 2004). The study found that the “naming and renaming of buildings has proved to be an effective method for increasing feelings of community ownership.” (Gard’ner 2004).

The study illustrates the “genuine need for minority groups to retain their collective memory and local history” in spite of the fact that the building or sites may not be of “sufficient” architectural or historical merit in the wider community. “Without recognising what different communities’ value within their environment, the built heritage of these groups will continue to be ignored or only recognised as part of our common heritage by changes (Gard’ner 2004).

At the other extreme are the messages that are given to those who are vulnerable, considered ‘disposable’ or inferior, or, even less than human through devaluation, incarceration, institutionalization, and ghetto-ization (Clutterbuck and Novick 2003). The work of Thomas and Wolfensberger (1994) underlines that people are attracted to whatever/whomever they identify with and have positive mental associations to. Thus where people live and the outward appearance of a building is important – people can identify with typical apartment or home setting in the community versus segregated settings and “institutional” building that are unlike where most people live. Names of buildings and services can connote competency, status, beauty or honour and the positive impression will extend to the people who use them. Thomas and Wolfensberger also draw attention to the surroundings where housing and services are situated. For example, location next to uses that are negatively valued in society, such as garbage, death, vice, shabbiness or poverty reinforce that the persons using these are “devalued people”, yet often services for these groups are found to have been put next or near to garbage dumps, cemeteries, funeral homes, and condemned or abandoned buildings.

2. CANADIAN LITERATURE

2.1 Is there a relationship between urban form and social inclusion?

There is little discussion in the Canadian literature of the relationship between urban form and social inclusion per se, although the literature on social inclusion is growing. Only a few authors in the published literature turn their attention to the influence that urban form or its variants may have on social inclusion. Andrews (2003) asserts that this is partly due to a dearth of reports on practical, local experiences in the academic literature. Alternatively, it may be that local governments have tended to "evade" responsibility for social issues, with the "unfortunate result that the design of cities is not generally seen as a social question".

There is also a substantial amount of literature on sustainable cities or compact cities. Smart growth proponents laud the compact city as being liveable, economically viable and environmentally sustainable. Thus we can find dialogue employing related concepts, such as quality of life, liveability or social sustainability in place of social inclusion and cities, settlements, urban space and collective space in place of urban form.

To the extent that it exists, the concern with the role of urban form in social inclusion is part of a larger debate on the importance of place, space or location in public social policy generally. Bradford (2005) states that cities are "the places where today's major public policy challenges are being played out" and has written extensively on the need for place-based public policy, or an urban lens.

The local perspective on social inclusion (which is a prelude to a role for urban form) is based on the recognition that social exclusion occurs in specific neighbourhoods. "This leads to place-specific 'neighbourhood effects' whereby social exclusion, perhaps originating in individual human capital deficiencies or unemployment, is compounded by features of the locality itself" (Bradford 2005).

Inadequate public transportation, poor schools and recreation areas, and other local concerns may produce neighbourhood effects. While Canadian experience with neighbourhood effects is less severe than in the US, disturbing trends towards a concentration of poverty in central cities are apparent, providing evidence of neighbourhood effects.

The idea that location or space is integral to fostering social inclusion is brought forward by Carolyn Andrews (2001). She argued in a presentation to the 2001 Social Inclusion Conference that "social inclusion is the foundation of civic and community life" and that space has a very important role to play in social inclusion. Polese and Stren (2000), in their work on the social sustainability of cities, link urban policy with "social sustainability", a concept related to social inclusion. They hypothesise that the social sustainability of cities is affected by not only national social/economic and other policies, but also by local policies "which appear to be banal and prosaic":

> ...the capacity of urban environments to be 'inclusive' and to promote social sustainability, will to a significant degree depend on such seemingly prosaic matters as the design of streets, the removal of garbage, the pricing of public transport, the adequate registration

> of property rights, the location of employment nodes, the management of school districts,…

Other Canadian works on this topic include Alexander, Tomalty and Anielski (2004) who examined empirically the relationship between urban form and liveability, and Scott and Horner's (2004) look at transportation and social inclusion. To the extent that it is considered, most authors address the issue in a conceptual way. There is little empirical exploration of the relationship between urban form and social inclusion.

Discussions about the social role of local governments or cities do not necessarily address the question of urban form; rather there is a focus on local provision or facilitation of the provision of social services (Torjman 2003).

2.2 History/development of understanding

Early Canadian planners and urban policy makers believed that living conditions could positively affect people's lives, a type of material determinism:

> …Regent Park is a double-edged urban form. Its row houses and low- and high-rise apartments reflect the sincere (if paternalistic and, in retrospect, naïve) belief of social reformers at the time it was built that the state could constructively affect the lives of low-income people by dramatically altering their housing conditions. (Caulfield 1994)

The prevailing attitude of the period is captured in a National Film Board short, *Farewell Oak St*, in which an unhappy family living in a dilapidated old Cabbagetown house becomes a happy family after moving to a new Regent Park apartment.

In the 1970s, the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs (MSUA), in a brief experiment with federal urban policy making, posited a link between urban performance and "quality of life", without demonstrating explicitly the connections:

> …without raising urban performance, it is impossible to improve the quality of life in cities; …the reverse would not necessarily be true: the raising of human performance does not constitute a guarantee of an improved quality of life… other factors such as individual freedom, social justice, economic prosperity… come into play… (Government of Canada/ Michel Lincourt et al 1973)

Today there is a renewed interest in urban environments not seen since the 1970s. The striking of the Prime Minister's Caucus Task Force on Urban Issues, the creation of Canada's Urban Strategy and the New Deal for Cities and Communities promising enhanced infrastructure funding, all underline the growing importance of urban regions to Canada's social and economic prosperity.

2.3 Pathways

What are the pathways by which urban form affects social inclusion? What dimensions of urban form are important? The Canadian literature focused on four dimensions: transportation, density and mixed land use, housing/social mix and public space.

2.3.1 Transportation

Transportation, and the corresponding accessibility it provides, is the dimension of urban form that receives the most attention (Andrews n.d.; Polese and Stren 2000; Scott and Horner 2004; Torjman 2003). Here transportation refers to both public transportation and private transportation (the automobile). According to mostly conceptual studies, accessibility is a primary factor in social inclusion. Transportation can play a key role in promoting social inclusion by affording individual accessibility to the critical functions of city living.

Both cost of public transport and its location/availability are pertinent. For example, in Toronto, researchers have discovered that social inclusion is promoted by a one-fare transit policy that aims to erase the effect of location from accessibility to public transit (Stren 2001).

On the other hand, other transportation policies can promote exclusion. Policies to promote the use of the car through highway or urban road investments can have negative effects on the fight against exclusion: "…perhaps in no other policy area are the indirect and often unforeseen consequences of policy choices on exclusion as important as in urban transportation" (Polese and Stren 2002). Car based growth, featuring highways and isolated residential enclaves, foster exclusion because public transport becomes very costly to introduce after the fact; and it will create dispersed settlement patterns where people are segregated, both of which would act against inclusion.

Scott and Horner (2004) note there is a small but growing literature on transport and social exclusion worldwide, but it is still in its infancy. Most of the work is conceptual, with hypothesized links mostly focused on mobility. These studies suggest that differential access to mobility tools can reinforce social exclusion. Some of the findings are:

- Clustered "opportunities" imply more exclusion, and vice versa;
- May be substantial variations among social groups.

In their empirical study, the relationship between urban form and social exclusion is explored by measuring the differential access of various socio-economic groups in Louisville, Kentucky to "urban opportunities". Scott and Horner find that:

> …groups which conventional wisdom would suggest are at risk of social exclusion, are **not at a disadvantage at all in terms of accessibility**. Rather than suffering from poor accessibility, they experience higher accessibility in general than their counterparts…

This held true for most different types of at risk households (low income, single parent, women, and elderly), with the exception of rural households.

2.3.2 Density and land use mix

Density is a measure of the intensity of development in a city. While density per se does not figure prominently in the Canadian literature on urban form or social inclusion, the outcome of a lack of density, urban sprawl, does. Much of the North American dialogue around urban form turns inexorably to an illustration of the disadvantages of urban sprawl, with some attention to the social consequences of that sprawl:

> …without a unifying metropolitan framework or incentives to consume space more rationally, the ultimate outcome will often be an urban agglomeration comprising a set of autonomous and separate communities, isolated from one another not only by social, but geographic, distance. (Polese and Stren 2002)

A study commissioned by Smart Growth BC attempted to understand the linkages between urban form (specifically density and integration of land uses) and "liveability" and economic vitality in 26 communities throughout British Columbia (Alexander et al 2004). The authors examined 27 indicators, nine in each of three areas – urban form, liveability and economic vitality. The liveability indicators merely scratch the surface of anything approaching social inclusion, and include such things as share of population paying more than 30% of income for housing, and per capita hectares of parks and playgrounds. The findings suggest that there are significant linkages between urban form and liveability in larger municipalities, and less so for medium and smaller communities. Communities that scored high on density and land use mix also excelled in quality of life indicators, although it found that housing affordability may be sacrificed. The conclusion being that "smart growth" or compact metropolitan growth is more socially sustainable.

St. Lawrence in Toronto is being used as a model for the Regent Park Redevelopment because of its range of amenities and community services, among other things, consisting of employment, shopping, and restaurants. Community spaces and services are part of the mix. Focus groups viewed positively the connections to other communities, proximity of shopping, entertainment and employment. Results from a focus group undertaken by the Regent Park Collaborative Team in a study of the lessons from St. Lawrence for the planning of the redevelopment of Regent Park found a "sense of safety created by the active street life in the area", created by the stores and coffee shops along Front St. It also found that the "area's appealing physical appearance reinforced residents sense of commitment to staying in the area." (GHK International (Canada 2003).

2.3.3 Housing/social mix

The quality and affordability of housing (as a component of urban form) is frequently identified as a contributor to social inclusion or exclusion. This is based on the notion that "housing serves as a catalytic component that, besides providing benefits in and of itself, can facilitate and perhaps even magnify the effectiveness of other supports. As a place that should offer a sense of stability and physical security, housing can provide an individual with the constancy required to establish and nurture key assets and relationships that are vital to avoiding marginalization" (Policy Research Initiative (PRI) Project 2005). Without housing, one is, a priori, excluded and homelessness is an ultimate form of exclusion.

Different types of housing policies may affect exclusion. Stren and Polese (2002) note that in developed cities around the world, housing policies (frequently with the best of intentions) may foster exclusion. For example, rent control creates privileged renters who got there first, while social housing may concentrate large populations in a 'ghetto'. The level of exclusion depends upon the level of concentration. Housing policies may also act to foster inclusion if public services are available where immigrants live, and the concentration is not too great.

Mixed income housing or social mix is often cited as a tool for promoting social inclusion, but there is little evidence of its effectiveness. Its popularity appears to be based on the notion that diversity "contributes substantially to building social networks and civic engagement that will help the poor overcome exclusion" (Bradford 2002). Presumably, this diversity refers to both socio-economic status and ethno-cultural background and is particularly attractive in a multi-cultural urban environment.

There have been few assessments of social mix in a Canadian setting with the exception of False Creek South in Vancouver and St. Lawrence in Toronto. An early evaluation of False Creek South found that the actual demographics of residents broadly represented the metropolitan area mix, but that children, teens, and seniors were slightly under-represented. It also noted a decline in low-income households living in the neighbourhood between the 1981 and 1986 censuses, and cautioned that rising real estate prices and changing demographics might make it difficult to maintain the social mix (City of Vancouver 1989).

A later evaluation concluded that False Creek South achieved a significant degree of social mix, but that, as of 1996, the original social mix targets had been missed (City of Vancouver 2001). There were fewer families with children and more elderly than targeted and a higher proportion of high-income groups and lower proportion of low income groups than targeted. It noted that the divergence had increased since 1981, because earlier phases were on City-owned land and had a higher proportion of non-market housing. Although falling short of its target, the area was nevertheless considerably more balanced than the neighbouring Fairview Slopes residential development, which was developed at the same time, but with no social mix policy (and no social housing).

A post-occupancy evaluation of the False Creek South project in Vancouver concluded that the social mix that was achieved had little effect. It found that the impact of social mix on residents is not pronounced, that it is acceptable to most residents and that is has not changed their lives (Vischer Skaburskis Planners 1980). Specifically:

- There is a trend towards social homogeneity over time;
- The administrative effort to achieve fine grained social mix is not warranted compared to the results;
- Planning involvement is the best predictor of non-market resident satisfaction with social mix;
- Quality of the physical environment is crucial to mutual tolerance of different social groups;
- Social benefits of "sense of community" accrue to higher income, market households;
- Higher income resident satisfaction is only evident by their choice to live and remain there;
- Social mix has no negative effect on "neighbouring" behaviours and community patterns, but sponsor group involvement may have.

The findings for the St. Lawrence neighbourhood in Toronto are similar. Hulchanski (1990) concluded that "on the basis of almost any evaluative criteria" the project has been very successful in meeting its original goals and objectives for social mix, achieving 57% non-market housing and 16% family units.

In both cases, achieving the social mix objectives depended heavily on the availability and composition of federal government social housing programs. Hulchanski (1990) also noted federal assistance with the land purchase.

2.3.4 Public space

Public space, in the sense of a widely shared public core, plays a somewhat central role in the limited urban discourse about social inclusion. Such public spaces are settings, which bring people with differing backgrounds together for civic celebrations or to act as the symbolic centre of a city. Without a centre, with common public spaces, "there no longer is a city in the sense of a public city, shared by all, with parks, squares, streets and symbols of common urban destiny. Taken to the extreme, we see an anti-city: a hodgepodge of suburban villages jealous of their autonomy, bereft of a common centre and a spirit of shared existence" (Polese and Stren 2002).

The use of public space varies according to different groups. For example, one Canadian study reports that "[p]arks, public places, and commercial streets are often important to immigrants and one study on the subject showed that cultural communities use public parks more than native-born Quebecois" (Germain 2000). Who controls public space also can be a highly charged issue. A study by Isin and Siemiatycki (1999) followed the process of establishing a mosque in Toronto, which represented the "struggle over space" one of the "most recurring conflicts between immigrants and local governments in the Toronto area." While the proposals were seen as "non-Canadian", testing the limits of multiculturalism with their presence signalled that the city is "a tolerant, multicultural place, a place where all are welcome to live and contribute to the cultural and economic life of the region" (Isin and Siemiatycki 1999). As importantly however, Amin (2002), in examining this process, suggests that the debate around the building of the mosque also formed a "civic space" for "vibrant opposition and negotiation" that is "open to the discursive clashes of distributed citizenship".

2.4 Neighbourhoods

The concept of social exclusion lends itself an analysis of area-specific factors, including the concentration of poverty (Cushing 2003). Much of the concern and research about concentrations of poverty has taken place in the US, with more recent UK focus on disadvantaged communities. Work in Canada points to similar spatial trends. An example of the spatial nature of inequality can be found in the United Way's *Poverty by Postal Code* study in Toronto (United Way and CCSD n.d.). It looked at the changes in the geography of poverty over a twenty-year period, from 1981 to 2001 and found that the concentration of family poverty is increasing. Twenty years ago, the vast majority of Toronto's 'poor' economic families lived in mixed-income neighbourhoods: for example, from 1981 to 2001, the proportion of 'poor' families residing in higher poverty neighbourhoods rose from almost 18% to 43%. Additionally, the increase in the number of higher poverty neighbourhoods has been especially acute in the inner suburbs.

However, the difficulty of assessing the impact of neighbourhood on individual outcomes is illustrated by a Canadian review of empirical evidence of neighbourhood effects which concludes, "residential environment matters most to an individual's mental health and exposure to crime, but has little influence on self-sufficiency [earnings, education

attainment unemployment and social assistance outcomes] and child development" (Oreopoulos 2005).

Papillon (2002) would suggest that exclusion per se is not the problem and can be beneficial for some groups; rather the issue is one of poverty.

> The spatial concentration of immigrants, often portrayed as fostering exclusion, may not be a problem in itself. On the one hand, it seems to contribute to the creation of social networks and may facilitate access to employment. On the other hand, when combined with poverty, spatial segregation can become an explosive mix, leading directly to the social exclusion of future generations. (Papillon 2002)

Part of the emphasis on neighbourhoods and what occurs within them stems from concerns about social cohesion, and one of its building blocks - social capital or the resources stemming from the strengths of relationships in communities. Distinctions are made between bonding social capital as found in families and close friends, bridging social capital that goes beyond ethnic and community boundaries, and linking social capital that reaches out into the wider world (Freiler 2004). These various kinds of social capital and access to them, especially the two latter types permit inclusion into a wider society. The work of Granovetter on "weak ties" emphasises their importance for the labour market and political movements. The stronger the ties connecting people the more similar they will be, whereas weak ties not only have a role in mobility but also in "cognitive flexibility", connecting diverse individuals (Granovetter 1983). The building of weak ties or bridging and linking social capital underpin some of the rationale for social mix in neighbourhoods and programs that stem to encourage this that are discussed below.

2.5 Social mix and its limitations

Canadian planners and social policy makers have tended to use "social mix" to promote social inclusion, and in fact the terminology is often used interchangeably. Focussing on housing and its pivotal role in gaining access, Hulchanski (1990) defines social mix as:

> …a planning principle which addresses fundamental justice and equity considerations. The issue is one of democracy: equal access to a basic necessity (housing) in a good quality living environment (neighbourhood). The goal is to be inclusive, not exclusive.

The aim is to counter the typical market driven and private sector development goal of "exclusivity" by physically including a range of household types and incomes.

It is perhaps important to underline that the two major concepts behind the discussion of social mix remain fundamentally unclear. What constitutes a neighbourhood or community is open to interpretation and can be seen as functional, a place to live, shop, play; symbolic, related to its history or personal importance; or social, a place for close relationships (Germain et al. 1995). Furthermore, what constitutes a "mixed community" is equally unclear. Is it a blending of household types, ages, ethnicities, incomes or tenure? At what level are these blended - street, development, electoral ward, town or social network without physical boundaries? (Dansereau et al. 2002)

A review of social mix projects (Dansereau et al. 2002) concludes that opportunities for communication between different groups is essential and public and semi public spaces, such as parks and pedestrian walkways, meeting points such as cafés and social centres are needed. A study of intercultural cohabitation in seven Montréal neighbourhoods confirmed the need for non-residential spaces to support social mix (Germain et al. 1995). One neighbourhood that was not only dense, but also has a lively commercial sector, was found to encourage daily mix and crossing of paths. Added to this is a long tradition of community life that all add up to a strong neighbourhood image, which can serve as common ground for residents (Germain et al. 1995). This is contrasted with another Montréal neighbourhood which also has a strong history and image, but because it is composed mostly of residential uses (both condos, townhouses and public housing) and little other activity, there are few spaces to mix, with most lower income households remaining spatially captive while the upper income households go elsewhere for services and equipment lacking in the neighbourhood. In the same way a third, more suburban neighbourhood was found to have few spaces for interaction with social life occurring primarily in private spaces or in commercial malls.

Applying results from studies in Paris to the Montréal situation, three types of trajectories are proposed: crossing, parallel and separate. Because of mixed uses, most Montréal neighbourhoods are found to have opportunities for paths to cross although these are often the only places where exchange occurs (Germain et al. 1995). A more recent study of another Montréal neighbourhood (Rose and Iankova 2004) examined an older working class francophone neighbourhood that has recently received an influx of Haitian immigrants. While young mothers were found to use parks and to share childcare there appeared to be little mingling between the two communities. Differences that kept people separate were not only cultural but religious, tenure, and perceptions of racism. The lack of commercial activity that can serve the needs of both groups was seen as reducing interethnic contacts and while community centres were well used in the neighbourhood, the two groups did not seem to use the same ones. The study concludes that the difficulties in the neighbourhood stem from a proximity that was not chosen by residents and the lack of non-menacing, routine contact, including a segmented community network.

2.6 Policies and strategies

The literature discusses some policies and strategies that may promote social inclusion in the urban form. A common theme concerns the importance of the local perspective in planning and policy-making decisions as well as public or stakeholder participation in planning. For instance, Bradford (2005) calls for a “local lens” in implementing nationally conceived policies and programs, or what he terms “local contextual intelligence’’ as a way of grounding a federal social policy or programs in the locality and needs of its residents. Others deem that local public input is a central element in positive planning and decision-making with the caution that local “empowerment” can work against social inclusion, specifically in the form of NIMBY reactions to various forms of social housing for example. This was demonstrated in the St. Lawrence project, where an open and democratic planning process was viewed as critical to the success of the neighbourhood (Hulchanski 1990).

Comprehensive metropolitan spatial planning or regional planning is also viewed as a vehicle for promoting social sustainability, or avoiding the isolation and segregation so

often typical of car based urban centres. Actions that will counteract the tendency towards sprawl or promote urban intensification are generally seen as positive in terms of their potential impact on social inclusion. “Smart growth” policies would tend to be the embodiment of these principles.

There is also a role for urban design and land use planning to play in making cities more inclusive places. One obvious goal is to avoid carving physical spaces into isolated zones, but rather an emphasis on mixed development (Bradford, 2002). Polese and Stren (2002) explore the importance of metropolitan spatial planning as a socially integrating factor and note that strong planning, generally with aim of strong city centre, correlates with strong socially mixed downtowns (in Canada and Europe cases).

APPENDIX B: KEY INFORMANTS

	Name	Affiliation
1.	Caroline Andrew	Professor, School of Political Studies, University of Ottawa
2.	Derek Ballantyne	CEO, Toronto Community Housing Corporation
3.	John Burrett	Senior Manager, Social Policy, Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)
4.	Judy Forrest	Chair, Research and Policy Committee, Canadian Housing and Renewal Association (CHRA)
5.	Christa Freiler	National Coordinator, Inclusive Cities Canada (project coming to a close)
6.	Nicholas Gazzard	Executive Director, Co-operative Housing Federation of Canada
7.	Cameron Gray	Manager, Housing Centre, City of Vancouver
8.	David Hulchanski	Director, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto
9.	Damaris Rose	Professor, Institut national de la recherche scientifique (INRS) - Urbanisation, Culture et Société.
10.	Patrick Stewart	President, Architectural Institute of British Columbia; Chair, Aboriginal Homelessness Steering Committee
11.	Richard Stren	Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto
12.	Stuart Sykes	Senior Policy Research Officer, Policy Research Initiative (PRI)
13.	Martin Wexler	Planner, City of Montréal
14.	Dave Witty	Dean, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba; former Principal, Urban Systems Ltd. in British Columbia
15.	Patricia Wood	Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, York University

APPENDIX C: PANEL MEMBERS

	Name	Affiliation
1.	Annick Germain	Institut national de la recherche scientifique (INRS)
2.	Cameron Gray	Manager, Housing Centre, City of Vancouver
3.	David Hulchanski	Director, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto
4.	Martin Wexler	Planner, City of Montréal
5.	Dave Witty	Dean, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba; former Principal, Urban Systems Ltd. in British Columbia
6.	Patricia Wood	Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, York University

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Don, Ray Tomalty and Mark Anielski. (2004) *Sprawl Report 2004. Economic Vitality and Livable Communities*. Smarthgrowth BC. From: http://www.smartgrowth.bc.ca/downloads/Sprawl2004.pdf

Amin, Ash (2002) “Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity. *Environment and Planning* A. 34:959-980.

Andrew, Caroline. (No date) S*ocial Inclusion: The Foundation of Civic and Community Life.* Ottawa: Canadian Council for Social Development.

Andrew, Caroline. “Cities and Polarization.*”* Notes from a presentation to the 2003 Social Inclusion Research Conference.

Arthurson, Kathy. (2002) "Creating Inclusive Communities through Balancing Social Mix: A Critical Relationship or Tenuous Link?" *Urban Policy and Research* 20(3): 245-261.

Atkinson, Rob. (2000) "Combating Social Exclusion in Europe: The New Urban Policy Challenge." *Urban Studies* 37(5-6): 1037-1055.

Atkinson, Rob. (2001) "The Emerging 'Urban Agenda' and the European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards and EU Urban Policy?" *European Planning Studies* 9(3).

Atkinson, Rowland. (2003) "Domestication by *Cappuccino* or a Revenge on Urban Space? Control and Empowerment in the Management of Public Spaces." *Urban Studies* 40(9): 1829-1843.

Bartley, Brendan. (1998) “Exclusion, invisibility and the neighbourhood in West Dublin.” *Social exclusion in European cities: processes, experiences, and responses*. Edited by A. Madanipour. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

Berube, Alan. (2005) *Mixed communities in England: A US perspective on evidence and policy prospects.* Brookings Institution and Joseph Rowntree Foundation. www.jrf.org.uk

Blanc, Maurice. (1998) "Social Integration and Exclusion in France: Some introductory remarks from a social transaction perspective." *Housing Studies* 13(6).

Bradford, Neil. (2005) *Place-based Public Policy: Towards a New Urban and Community Agenda for Canada*. Research Report F 51. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Network.

Bradford, Neil. (2002) *Why Cities Matter: Policy Research Perspectives for Canada.* CPRN Discussion Paper No F 23. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Network.

Bramley, Glem and Senead Power. (2005) *City Form and Social Sustainability.* Working Paper. Edinburgh: CityForm consortium.

Buck, Nick. (2001) "Identifying Neighbourhood Effects on Social Exclusion." *Urban Studies* 38(12): 2251-2275.

Burchardt, Tania, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud. (2002) Introduction. *Understanding Social Exclusion.* Edited by J. Hills, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burrows, Roger. (1997). "The changing population in social housing in England." *Findings: Housing Research No. 202*. Retrieved January 2006, from: http://www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/H202.asp

CMHC. National Office Support Centre. (1981) *St. Lawrence Phase A1 Comprehensive Monitoring Report.* Ottawa: CMHC.

CMHC National Office Support Centre. (1983) *The St. Lawrence Neighbourhood: A Study of Public and Semi-public Amenity Areas and Parking.* Ottawa: CMHC.

Cameron, Stuart and Simin Davoudi. (1998) “Social exclusion and neighbourhoods: looking in or looking out?” *Social Exclusion in Cities: the Urban Policy Challenge*. Edited by R. Griffiths. Bristol: Faculty of the Built Environment, University of the West of England.

Cars, Göran, Ali Madanapour and Judith Allen (1998) “Social exclusion and European cities.” *Social exclusion in European cities: processes, experiences, and responses.* Edited by A. Madanipour. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

Caulfield, Jon. (1994) *City Form and Everyday Life: Toronto’s gentrification and critical social practise.*

Chisolm, Sharon. (2002) “Adjusting Housing Practice towards a Social Inclusion Framework”. Presentation to the Canadian Council on Social Development Conference. What do we know and where do we go? Building a Social Inclusion Research Agenda.

City of Langford. (2005) *Affordable Housing, Park and Amenity Contribution Policy*. No: 6930-00-003.

City of Vancouver. Housing Centre. Community Services Group. (2001) *False Creek South Shore: Evaluation of Social Mix Objectives.*

City of Vancouver. Planning Department. (1989).*Evaluation of False Creek South Social Objective*s.

City of Vancouver. (1974).O*fficial Development Plan for False Creek.*

Clutterbuck, Peter and Marvyn Novick. (2003) *Building Inclusive Communities: Cross Canada Perspectives and Strategies*. Prepared for the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Laidlaw Foundation.

Clutterbuck, Peter. (2001) Social Inclusion: “Raising or Removing the Bar?”: What Participants said: Highlights and Summary of Social Inclusion Roundtable Sessions. Toronto: Laidlaw Foundation, December.

Cole, Ian and Barry Goodchild. (2000) "Social Mix and the 'Balanced Community' in British housing policy - a tale of two epochs." *GeoJournal* 51(4): 351-360.

Crawford, Emily. (2003) "Equity and the City: The Case of the East Perth Redevelopment." *Urban Policy and Research* 21(1): 81-92.

Cushing, Pamela. (2003) *Policy Approaches to Framing Social Inclusion and Exclusion: An Overview.* Policy paper for The Roeher Institute. York University, North York: Canada

Dansereau, Francine, Stéphane Charbonneau, Richard Morin, Anne Revillard, Damaris Rose and Anne-Marie Séguin. (2002) *La mixité sociale en habitation: Rapport de recherche réalisé pour le Service de l'habitation de la Ville de Montréal*. Montréal : Ville de Montréal.

Dansereau, Francine et al. (No date). *La Mixité Sociale en Habitation*. Rapport de recherche réalisé pour le Service de l'habitation de la Ville de Montréal.

Dewilde, Caroline and Femke De Keulenaer. (2003). "Housing and Poverty: The 'Missing Link' " *European Journal of Housing Policy* 3(2): 127-153.

Farrington, Fletcher. (2002) "Towards a Useful Definition: Advantages and Criticisms of 'Social Exclusion'" *GEO View*. The School of Geography, Population and Environmental Management, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia:
http://www.ssn.flinders.edu.au/geog/geos/farrington.html

Frazee, Catherine. (2003) *Thumbs Up! Inclusion, Rights and Equality as Experienced by Youth with Disabilities*. Laidlaw Foundation Working Paper Series.

Freiler, Christine. (2004) *Why Strong Neighbourhoods Matter: Implications for Policy and Practice*. Report prepared for the Strong Neighbourhoods Task Force Toronto, November.

GHK International, Greenberg Consultants, Markson Borooah Hodgson Architects, David Millar Associates and Connelly Consulting Services. (2003) *Lessons from St. Lawrence for the Regent Park Redevelopment Process.* Submitted to the Toronto Community Housing Corporation.

Gard'ner, James Maitland. (2004) "Heritage Protection and Social Inclusion: A case study from the Bangladeshi community of East London." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10(1): 75-92.

Germain, Annick. (2000) *Immigrants and cities: Does neighbourhood matter?* Paper presented at the Transatlantic Learning Committee special meeting. Montréal, May 23, 2000.

Germain, Annick et al. (1995) *Cohabitation interethnique et vie de quartier*. Montréal: INRS-Urbanisation.

Gilroy, Rose and Suzanne Speak. (1998) "Barriers, boxes and catapults: social exclusion and everyday life." *Social exclusion in European cities: processes,*

experiences, and responses. Edited by A. Madanipour. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

Gingrich, Luan Good. (2003) "Social Exclusion as an Individual Kind: A Categorical Point of View". *Canadian Review of Social Policy* Fall 52 p.93.

Government of Canada / Michel Lincourt [et al.] (1973) *Urban form/quality of life: A policy document prepared for the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs.* Montréal: General Urban Systems Corporation.

Granovetter, Mark. (1983) "The strength of weak ties: a network theory revisited". *Sociological Theory* Vol.1: 201-233

Griffiths, Ron. (1998) *Social Exclusion in Cities: the Urban Policy Challenge*. Bristol: Faculty of the Built Environment, University of the West of England.

Guildford, Janet. (2000) *Making the Case for Social and Economic Inclusion*. Health Canada. Population and Health Branch, Atlantic Region.

Häussermann, Hartmut and Anne Haila. (2005) "The European City: A Conceptual Framework and Normative Project." *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements, and the Challenge to Social Cohesion*. Edited by Y. Kazepov. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Healy, Patsy. (1998) "Institutionalist theory, social exclusion and governance." *Social Exclusion in European Cities*. Edited by A. Madanipour. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Howard T. and J. Nelson. (1982) "The form and structure of cities: urban growth patterns" in Bourne, Larry, ed. *Internal Structure of the City: Readings on space and environment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hulchanski, David J. (1990) *Planning New Urban Neighbourhoods: Lessons from Toronto's St. Lawrence Neighbourhood*. UBC Planning Papers. CPI #28. Vancouver: School of Community and Regional Planning.

Hulchanski, D. (1984) *St. Lawrence and False Creek: A Review of the Planning and development of Two New Inner City Neighbourhoods.* UBC Planning Papers. CPI #10. Vancouver: School of Community and Regional Planning.

Hulchanski, David. Forthcoming.

Isin, Engin F. and Myer Siemiatycki. (1999) *Fate and Faith: claiming urban citizenship in immigrant Toronto.* Toronto: Joint Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement, Working Paper No. 8.

Kazepov, Yuri (2005) "Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements, and the Challenge to Social Cohesion." *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements, and the Challenge to Social Cohesion*. Edited by Y. Kazepov. Malden, MA; Oxford; Victoria, Blackwell.

Kirwan, R. M. (1996) *Strategies for housing and social integration in cities*. Paris Washington, D.C.: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development;OECD Publications and Information Center, distributor.

Kohn, Margaret (2004) *Brave New Neighbourhoods: The privatization of public space* New York: Routledge.

Lee, Peter and Alan Murie. (1999) "Spatial and Social Divisions within British Cities: Beyond Residualisation." *Housing Studies* 14(5): 625-640.

Lupton, Ruth and Anne Power (2002) Social Exclusion and Neighbourhoods. *Understanding Social Exclusion*. Edited by J. Hills, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lynch, Kevin. (1989) *Good City Form*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

MacLeod, Gordon. (2002) "From Urban Entrepreneurialism to a "Revanchist City"? On the Spatial Injustices of Glasgow's Renaissance." *Antipode* 34(3): 602-624.

Madanipour, Ali. (1998) "Social exclusion and space." *Social exclusion in European cities: processes, experiences, and responses.* Edited by A. Madanipour. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

Madanipour, Ali, Göran Cars, Judith Allen and Regional Studies Association. (London England), Eds. (1998) *Social exclusion in European cities: processes, experiences, and responses*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

Mangen, S.P. (2004) *Social Exclusion and Inner City Europe: Regulating Urban Regeneration.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marcuse, Peter. (1997) "The Ghetto of Exclusion and the Fortified Enclave: New patterns in the United States". *American Behavioral Scientist* Vol 41. No. 3 p.311-326.

Marsh, Alex and David Mullins. (1998) "The Social Exclusion Perspective and Housing Studies: Origins, Applications and Limitations." *Housing Studies* 13(6): 749-759.

Montgomery, John. (1998) "Making a City: Urbanity, Vitality and Urban Design." *Journal of Urban Design* 3(1).

Murie, Alan. (2005) "The Dynamics of Social Exclusion and Neighborhood Decline: Welfare Regimes, Decommodification, Housing, and Urban Inequality." *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements, and the Challenge to Social Cohesion.* Edited by Y. Kazepov. Malden, MA; Oxford; Victoria, Blackwell.

Murie, Alan and Sako Musterd. (2004) "Social Exclusion and Opportunity Structures in European Cities and Neighbourhoods" *Urban Studies* 41(8): 1441-1459

Musterd, Sako, Chris Kesteloot, Alan Murie, and Wim Ostendorf. (1999) "Urban Social Exclusion and Modes of Integration - Literature review." 2005, from: http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/urbex/resrep/abs/abs_1.htm

Musterd, Sako and Wim Ostendorf. (2005) “Social Exclusion, Segregation, and Neighbourhood Effects“ *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements, and the Challenge to Social Cohesion*. Edited by Y. Kazepov. Malden, MA; Oxford; Victoria, Blackwell.

Nelson, T Howard J. (1982) “The form and structure of cities: urban growth patterns.” Edited by Bourne, Larry. *Internal Structure of the City: Readings on space and environment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Oreopoulos, Philip. (2005) *A Critique on Neighbourhood Effects in Canada*. New Approaches for Addressing Poverty and Exclusion. Working Paper Series 004. Policy Research Initiative.

Papillon, Martin. (2002) *Immigration, Diversity and Social Inclusion in Canada’s Cities*. Discussion Paper F 27. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc.

Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism.* Palgrave: Basingstoke.

Polese, Mario and Richard Stren, eds. (2000). *Social Sustainability of Cities. Diversity and the Management of Change.* Toronto: U of T Press.

PRI Project. (2005) *Housing Policy and Practice in the Context of Poverty and Exclusion. Synthesis Report.* August 2005. Policy Research Initiative.

Richardson, Liz and Julian Le Grand (2002) *Outsider and Insider Expertise: The response of residents of deprived neighbourhoods to an academic definition of social exclusion.* CASE Paper 57. London:Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion.

Roberts, Marion. (2000) "Banlieues 89: Urban Design and the Urban Question." *Journal of Urban Design.* 5(1): 19-40.

Rose, Damaris and Katia Iankova. (2004) *Proximité spatial, distance sociale: les rapports interethniques dans un secteur défavorisé à Montréal vus à travers les pratiques de voisinage quartier*. Montréal: INRS-Urbanisation.

Ryerson Polytechnical Institute. (1990) *Directions for New Urban Neighbourhoods: Learning from St. Lawrence.*

Sassen, Saskia. (2004) “Local Actors in Global Politics.” *Current Sociology* Vol. 52, No. 4, p. 649-670.

Sassen, Saskia. (2000) *Cities in a World Economy* (new updated edition). Pine Forge: Sage Press.

Sassen, Saskia. (1991) *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Scott, D.M. and M.W. Horner. (2004) *Urban Form and Social Exclusion: An Exploratory Analysis in a U.S. Setting.* Working Paper Series. Centre for Spatial Analysis. Hamilton:McMaster University.

Sgro, Judy. (2002) *Canada's Urban Strategy: A Blueprint for Action. Final Report*. Ottawa: Prime Minister's Caucus Task Force on Urban Issues.

Simon, Patrick. (2005) "Gentrification of Old Neighbourhoods and Social Integration in Europe." *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements, and the Challenge to Social Cohesion.* Edited by Y. Kazepov. Malden, MA; Oxford; Victoria, Blackwell.

Skogan, Wesley G. (1990) *Disorder and decline: crime and the spiral of decay in American neighborhoods.* New York Toronto, Free Press; Collier Macmillan Canada.

Song, Yan and Gerrit-Jan Knaap. (2004) "Measuring Urban Form." *Journal of American Planning Association.* 70 (2), 210.

Stewart, Murray and Ron Griffiths. (1998) "Social exclusion and urban policy: a framework for discussion." *Social Exclusion in Cities: the Urban Policy Challenge*. Edited by R. Griffiths. Bristol: Faculty of the Built Environment, University of the West of England.

Stren, Richard. (2001) *Thinking About Urban Inclusiveness*. University of Toronto. Centre for Urban and Community Studies. Research Bulletin #4. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Thomas, Susan and Wolf Wolfensberger. (1994) "The importance of social imagery in interpreting societally devalued people to the public." *SRV-VRS: The International Social Role Valorization Journal* Vol 1(1).

Torjman, Sherri and Eric Levtien-Reid. (2003) *The Social Role of Local Government.* Caledon Institute of Social Policy.

United Way and Canadian Council on Social Development. (No date) *Poverty by Postal Code. Executive Summary*.

UK. Department for Culture, Media and Sport. (2002) "People and Places: Social Inclusion Policy for the Built and Historic Environment" from: http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_2002/people_places.htm?properties=%2C%2C&month

van Kempen, Ronald. (2005) "Segregation and Housing Conditions of Immigrants in Western European Cities." *Cities of Europe: Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements, and the Challenge to Social Cohesion*. Edited by Y. Kazepov. Malden, MA; Oxford; Victoria, Blackwell.

Vestergaard, Hedvig. (1998) "Troubled housing estates in Denmark." *Social Exclusion in European Cities.* Edited by A. Madanipour. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

Ville de Montréal (2006) Stratégie d'inclusion de logements abordables: http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/pls/portal/docs/page/habiter_fr/media/documents/doc_inc.pdf

Vischer Skaburskis, Planners. (1980) *False Creek Area 6, Phase 1 Post Occupancy Evaluation. Volume 1: Executive Summary.* Prepared for CMHC.

Wilson, James Q., and George Kelling. (1982) "Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety" *Atlantic Monthly*.

Wrigley, Neil (2002) "'Food Deserts' in British Cities: Policy Context and Research Priorities." *Urban Studies* 39(11): 2029-2040.

Wrigley, Neil, Cliff Guy and Michelle Lowe. (2002) "Urban Regeneration, Social Inclusion and Large Store Development: The Seacroft Development in Context." *Urban Studies* 39(11): 2101-2114.

Websites

Communauté Milton Parc: http://www.miltonparc.org/

Benny Farm Redevelopment: http://www.bennyfarm.org/

Social Exclusion Unit: http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/

Visit our website at www.cmhc.ca