

623310376

SEP 7 2012

HT
165.53
C84
S53
2011

**PLANNING FOR SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY IN TORONTO:
CONSIDERATIONS OF GOVERNANCE AND PLANNING POLICY**

by

Aslam Shaikh, BA (Hons), University of Toronto, 2008

A Major Research Paper
presented to Ryerson University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Planning
in
Urban Development

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2011

PROPERTY OF
RYERSON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

© Aslam Shaikh 2011

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this major research paper.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this paper to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this paper by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

**PLANNING FOR THE SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY OF TORONTO:
CONSIDERATIONS OF GOVERNANCE AND PLANNING POLICY**

© Aslam Shaikh, 2011

Master of Planning
in
Urban Development
Ryerson University

ABSTRACT

This paper argues for a greater emphasis to be placed on the need to plan cities to better ensure their social sustainability. Through an examination of planning policy, this paper describes the general lack of provisions or conditions in planning policy for ensuring a more socially sustainable future in Ontario municipalities, including Toronto. It is argued that government reform in Ontario has hindered the ability for municipalities to maintain social sustainability. Recommendations are made for the role that the province can take to once again strive for social sustainability through the inclusion of statements within provincial policy that aim to address social issues. It is also suggested that greater social sustainability can be fostered through a more effective and meaningful civic engagement process that serves as a forum to hear the input of citizens in describing the diverse needs of their communities.

Key words: social sustainability, planning, social equity

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the Ryerson Masters of Planning in Urban Development graduate class of 2011. I am grateful to have been able to meet such a talented group of future planners, and can attribute a substantial amount of my learning and understanding of planning to my discussions and debates with my fellow class members. It was a pleasure to work with others passionate in cities and urban planning, and I look forward to watching each of us find success in our careers.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Sandeep Agrawal for his advice and guidance throughout this entire process. I would also like to sincerely thank each of the faculty members in School of Urban & Regional Planning at Ryerson University. This work is the collection of the combined learning, experiences, and inspirations that you have given us throughout your classes, and none of us would be as well rounded and forward thinking planners as we are if it wasn't for all of you. Thank you.

Finally, I would like to thank my family members and my friends for encouraging me to pursue this degree. Without their support and encouragement, I would not have been able to complete these past two years.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Social Sustainability in the City of Toronto.....	3
The intent and scope of this research	6
Chapter 2: Conceptualizing and contextualizing social sustainability	9
The birth and evolution of the ‘Sustainability Revolution’.....	10
Defining social sustainability.....	13
Why strive for social sustainability through planning practice	16
Chapter 3: How governance dynamics affect social sustainability	19
The reconfiguration of local-provincial governance structures in Ontario.....	19
The effect of governance reforms on social sustainability in Toronto	22
Chapter 4: Current planning policies for promoting social sustainability	29
Provincial planning policy responses to social sustainability.....	30
Municipal planning policy responses to social sustainability	36
Recommendations for planning policy improvements.....	38
Chapter 5: Strengthening social sustainability through improved citizen discourse	43
The need for a more effective citizen engagement process	43
Creating community level governance for Toronto’s social sustainability	48
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	53
Bibliography.....	55

Chapter 1: Introduction

Cities such as Toronto are in a constant state of flux. This constant change is especially true for cities like Toronto that feature persistent shifts in population and demographics, are immigrant rich, and contain a highly heterogeneous population with a wide range of lifestyle and socioeconomic groups. Governments in highly diverse cities are constantly being challenged to find the means to adapt their policies to better serve the evolving needs of their citizens. Although a definition will be further developed later on, this paper advances an explanation of social sustainability as quite simply referring to a city's ability to sustain the social needs of the population. This state is achieved through ensuring fair and equitable access to the city's resources, specifically the resources that have an effect on an individual's life chances, and hence their quality of life. These resources can include access to infrastructure, adequate and affordable housing, education, health care, employment opportunities, access to a meaningful democratic process, or social capital.

In cities such as Toronto, achieving social sustainability cannot occur without recognizing diversity, including the ability to respond to the persistently evolving needs of its ever changing population. Policies, programs and processes aimed at sustaining a good quality of life (i.e. health care, housing, employment) need to be conscious of and highly responsive to the impacts that social change has on society and the ongoing operations of the city. As a profession that has historically been concerned with instilling civility, order, and rules, planners have increasingly struggled in grappling with the complexity of diversity. Susan Fainstein (2005) summarized this debate by questioning: can planners plan for diversity? Current research into the efforts of planners to foster diversity through

planning practise reveals that the success of these strategies is conflicted (August, 2008). For example, planning for diversity through mixed income communities has often been employed to attract middle-income households into existing communities of poverty. Part of the reasoning behind this is to reduce concentrations of poverty and neighbourhood blight, yet in many cases this strategy has resulted in gentrification and led to the exclusion of already marginalized populations (Lees, 2008) (Smets & Uyl, 2008). Other theories behind the purpose of mixed income communities suggest that they may be intended to create opportunities by helping underemployed or lower income individuals seek better job prospects, although research has revealed that this goal has not always successfully been achieved (Galster, Andersson, & Musterd, 2010) (Musterd & Andersson, 2005).

As Fainstein (2005) argues, there are difficulties in planning communities with the goal of promoting diversity; she argues that true diversity manifests itself organically, whereas planned diversity comes off as inauthentic. Due to the inherent difficulties in planning for diversity, Fainstein suggests planning should instead be setting goals on achieving the just city. By planning for the just city, greater social equity is achieved through ensuring more uniform access to resources within the city. As the ability to access these resources has an effect on an individual's life chances, ensuring access to these resources is critical to achieving social sustainability. Fainstein also argues that by planning for a just city that improves access to city resources, the capacity to improve the sustainability of communities is enhanced. By addressing barriers to resource access, cities can strive for a more uniform quality of life for its citizens, as opposed to attempts at seeking greater equity through goals of social mix and community cohesion.

Social sustainability in the City of Toronto

Toronto has done much to secure its place in the world as a progressive, forward thinking city in managing social issues. The City of Toronto has achieved considerable success in adopting a number of policies and programs aimed at recognizing and responding to the diversity of its population. Some examples of this include the Social Development Strategy (City of Toronto, 2001), the Employment Equity Policy (2000), the Immigration and Settlement Policy Framework (2001), the Multilingual Services Policy (2002), and the Days of Cultural Significance Policy (2004). An Office of Equity, Diversity, and Human Rights (formerly the Diversity Management and Community Engagement Unit) also exists that is responsible for ensuring that all departments and their policies with the city promote the principles of access, equity, and diversity, as stated in their vision statement (City of Toronto, n.d.)

Despite the existence of such policies, Toronto still faces many challenges to upholding social sustainability. A number of research findings have revealed trends of growing spatial segregation that has been occurring between polarizing socioeconomic groups within the city (Hulchanski, 2010; Bourne, 2007; Toronto Community Foundation, 2005; Murdie 1998). These research findings describe Toronto's neighbourhoods as becoming increasingly segregated by socioeconomic status – a trend that has been occurring for over 35 years (Hulchanski, 2010). Toronto's most locationally advantaged areas tend to be dominated by higher income groups, and also are communities of high ethnic homogeneity, higher educational attainment, and a relatively lower level of immigrants. Conversely, Toronto's less geographically advantaged areas feature comparatively lower incomes, higher concentrations of poverty, higher ethnic diversity,

lower educational attainment, and a significantly increasing numbers of immigrant and recent immigrant populations.

The social sustainability of the city is becoming jeopardized as communities of increased needs are isolated away from the growth, development, and prosperity that are being primarily invested into the central core of the city. The success of Toronto is a result of the economy of the entire city as a whole, yet the prosperity that results from this success is disproportionately concentrated in the central city core. The need for action to be taken now in consideration of the social sustainability of Toronto is imperative. Some of the solutions that have been suggested thus far have argued for the creation of mixed income communities amongst the pockets of poverty within the city (United Way Toronto, 2011) (Hulchanski, 2010). These strategies aim to achieve greater equity and improve the social sustainability of the afflicted neighbourhoods through introducing income diversity. These strategies have been employed in recent community revitalization projects in Toronto, such as in Regent Park (City of Toronto, 2007) and Lawrence Heights (City of Toronto, 2010).

Mixed income communities are not a new concept to planning, nor is it new to Toronto either. The concept of mixed income communities was used during the planning of the St. Lawrence neighbourhood over 30 years ago. Today, the neighbourhood is often cited as an example of the success that mixed income communities can achieve (Hulchanski, 1989). However, some planners have questioned this success. During a conference in 1989 entitled "Directions for New Urban Neighbourhoods: Learning from St. Lawrence", which was held with the intention of discussing the success of the St. Lawrence neighbourhood, Joseph Springer (1989) argued that while planners can cite St. Lawrence as

a successful neighbourhood, he disagrees that it accomplished its original goals involving the need to provide housing for low and moderate income families, as stated in the original plans for St. Lawrence. Although the neighbourhood did achieve social diversity, Springer argued that many of the rent geared-to-income units were priced out of reach of the populations in the direst need of affordable housing. He also questions how democratic the citizen engagement process was, suggesting that the opinions of lower income residents were lost amongst the rest (Springer, 1989).

This isn't to suggest that planners should avoid any strategies at promoting diversity; the benefits of diversity have long been argued in favour of, and many successful communities are highly diverse both in terms of a mix of land uses and in social diversity. However, as Fainstein (2005) argues and as evidenced by Springer (1989), caution should be taken when planning for diversity specifically with the goal of addressing social problems, as there still remains little evidence supporting the theory of how fostering social diversity improves the lives of residents located in communities with multiple needs. August's (2008) research also reveals what may be some of the intended yet questionable paternalistic undertones present in policy documents for mixed income communities, describing some of the expected effects of mixed communities as including the improved behaviour and increased work ethic of lower-income residents, after living in proximity to higher-income neighbours.

While mixed income communities may raise the overall income of a community and reduce concentrations of poverty, this does not necessarily translate into directly addressing the problems of access to resources that typically afflict poverty stricken neighbourhoods, nor do they address any of the structural forces within the city that have

contributed to the lack of sustainability of these areas. In fact, as the population of higher-income groups expands, as does the ability for their needs and demands to overshadow those of the lower-income groups, thus making lower-income community members less able to sustain themselves and thus more susceptible to being ejected from the neighbourhood from forces of gentrification or decreased social capital (Lees, 2008).

The intent and scope of this research

This paper considers the facts that Toronto is a highly diverse city that in spite of its diversity has been on an unsustainable path to becoming increasingly socioeconomically segregated, and that the inaction to address this social polarization threatens the sustainability of the city. It is argued that in resolving this issue, planners need to take caution in contemplating strategies to address social issues through the fostering of social mix and diversity, as research into these strategies has revealed little evidence for their ability to improve the lives of the marginalized residents already living in these communities. Instead, planners should be basing their strategies on striving for a more socially just and equitable city. Such a city would endeavour to ensure the equal access to and provision of services throughout the city, which would in turn enhance the capacities of communities to improve their own quality of life by ensuring access to the resources that affect their life chances.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the capacity for planners to improve the social sustainability of the city. Utilizing the definition of social sustainability as being the ability to ensure the equitable access to the resources of a city, this paper considers the ability of current planning policy, and the organization of governance models, in being able

to promote efforts intended to achieve social sustainability. Chapter 2 begins by exploring the definition of social sustainability, and contextualizing it within the ongoing wider discourse on sustainability (social, as well as environmental and economic). Using the case of Toronto, Chapter 3 and 4 examines two facets that are central to the ability to achieve social sustainability. In Chapter 3, the structure of governance in Toronto between the city, the region, and the province is examined and critiqued for its ability to both foster and hinder social sustainability. In Chapter 4, current planning policies at both the provincial and municipal levels are investigated and recommendations are provided for improving the ability of planners to attain social sustainability. Following both of these sections, Chapter 5 considers the necessity for an improved means of civic engagement and for the need to generate citizen discourse about issues within the city in order to better create the conditions for the just, equitable, and socially sustainable city.

Chapter 2:

Conceptualizing and contextualizing social sustainability

In this chapter, the concept of social sustainability will be traced from its emergence within the growing understanding of the overarching concept of sustainability. Following this, some definitions of social sustainability will be examined, and key indicators of social sustainability will be described. Finally, the relationship between urban planning and social sustainability will be explored, followed by an argument for why planners need to be more concerned with achieving urban social sustainability for the vitality of our cities' futures.

Sustainable development as a concept and practice has continually pushed its way into the discourse of a wide range of academic disciplines, government agendas, corporate strategies, and grassroots NGO mantras. Although the idea behind sustainable development has evolved and adapted to its various applications, its core values remain the same since its most popular definition in the Bruntland report: "Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (WCED, 1987)

During the past several decades, this statement has been interpreted and reiterated into many different stated goals throughout the world, and its understanding has become somewhat diluted. However, despite experiencing a considerable amount of reinterpretation, the core principles of sustainability have remained remarkably consistent: it recognises that we cannot continue to sustain our current means of living into

the future, and that our timeframe for addressing these issues is relentlessly becoming narrow.

Urban policy makers have recognized this idea as well, evident in the growing research and policy concerning the need to plan for more sustainable communities. As such, we have seen an increase in discussion about planning for urban environmental sustainability, and specific initiatives such as New Urbanism, green energy, sustainable architecture, and LEED certification have emerged as responses to the growing need for delivering more sustainable solutions. What has been lacking, however, has been a strong adoption of policies concerned with achieving and maintaining social sustainability in cities. The deficiency in the social dimensions of sustainability has been noted for quite some time in academic literature (Yiftachel & Hedgcock, 1993), and even recent investigations of social sustainability identify the continued ambiguity of the concept, and shortage of its use in practise. (Dempsey, Bramley, Power, & Brown, 2009).

In the next section, the evolution of the overarching concept of sustainability will be explored. It will be suggested that part of the reason for the subservience of social sustainability compared to environmental sustainability may stem from the fact that sustainability in general grew out of a movement that was originally grounded in environmentalism.

The birth and evolution of the 'Sustainability Revolution'

To understand the concepts underlying social sustainability, it is imperative to first examine the broader debate on sustainability and how it originally came to be. By examining key conceptual frameworks for understanding sustainability, it becomes clear

that the emphasis on the environmental aspect goes back to the roots of sustainability as being based in the growing environmental movement that took place during the late 1970s and early 1980s. Edwards (2005) calls this era the birth of the 'Sustainability Revolution' (p. 15), commencing with the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, an event that brought international attention to growing concerns over the state of the Earth's environment. The conference spurred a number of national and international responses to environmental concerns, and more importantly opened up discussion and an increasing recognition of the unsustainable use of the planet's resources, and the inevitable limitations that it would present to our ways of living (Edwards, 2005).

There was also a growing literature examining the relationship between development and its impact on the environment. This notion was advanced by the creation of the United Nation's World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) in 1983. The WCED was tasked with investigating strategies for invoking an international commitment to achieve long-term sustainable development. Under the leadership of former Norway prime minister Gro Harlem Bruntland, the WCED published *Our Common Future* in 1987 (often referred to as the Bruntland report), which was significant in bringing sustainable development discourse to the world stage (Edwards, 2005).

The Bruntland report was also particularly significant in pushing for an understanding of the interconnected nature between the ecological, economic, and equity issues (the three E's) necessary to consider in achieving sustainable development (WCED, 1987). This model of sustainability was further solidified during the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (also referred to as the Earth Summit) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The conference resulted with the adoption of the Rio Declaration, which

stated that the environment, economic, and social aspects of sustainability cannot be considered in isolation of each other (UNCED, 1992).

While the subject matter of the Earth Summit continued to focus primarily on the environmental considerations of sustainability, the formal shift towards the contemporary multilateral perspective occurred in 2002 during the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa. The Johannesburg conference placed a stronger importance on a holistic approach that called for greater attention to be given to the social and economic issues of sustainable development in addition to the attention already received by the environment. It is important to point out that the emphasis on social and economic issues originated out of debate and concern over growing international inequities between the global north and south, recognizing that truly sustainable development would require addressing these imbalances. As principles of sustainability made their way into national agendas, the key themes of sustainability were scaled down from global into local conceptualizations. Initiatives such as Local Agenda 21 and Local Action 21 were instrumental in encouraging national governments to develop their own local strategies for ensuring sustainability (Robinson, 2009).

To review, contemporary understandings of sustainable development emerged out of a discourse that was founded in environmentalism, but subsequently evolved to realise that economic and social issues were also central to attaining sustainability objectives. However, as international conferences on sustainability focused initially on the environment, this translated into an eco-centric model of sustainability by local governments as well, with many early local sustainable development agendas concentrating on strategies for the protection and preservation of the environment. Local

governments eventually embraced the contemporary model of sustainability following its emergence at the international scale, making mention of social, cultural, and equity issues as well. However, the emphasis on the environment continues to remain at the forefront of many local sustainability agendas even today.

Defining social sustainability

Social sustainability emerged out of environmental discourse as a way to evaluate the social effects on people caused by issues of the environment. Although social sustainability has largely grown into its own realm, it still is often regarded as subservient to environmental sustainability, and governments do not appear to be fully embracing the social aspect as fully or equally (Saha & Patterson, 2008). Even today, many sustainability initiatives focus predominantly on the environment, and are often created by the environmental departments of governmental institutions.

Yet there are good reasons for social sustainability to be considered in its own rite. As opposed to considering social issues individually i.e. focusing specifically and separately on social housing, social sustainability offers a holistic view of the social issues of the city. This holistic perspective is critical for understanding the interrelations between different social factors at varying scales of the city. Such a perspective is critical for determining the issues affecting systematic trends in spatial segregation such as the situation that has been occurring within Toronto. Social sustainability also places social issues into a long term perspective, understanding that the failure to address these issues can impact the ability of affected communities to continue to sustain themselves into the future.

Social sustainability is fundamentally concerned with how social issues hinder equity between different social groups with respect to access to resources. McKenzie provides a definition of social sustainability as being "a life enhancing condition within communities, and a process within communities that can achieve that condition" (p. 12), explaining that this condition requires equitable access to key resources (McKenzie, 2004). Jarvis et al (2001) focus on social equity, recognizing that the degree of an individual's ability to enjoy a good quality of life is directly associated with the ability of the institutional social structures within their city to be able to ensure fair and equitable access to the resources that affect an individual's life chances (i.e. social services, health care, education, housing, employment). Brameley and Power (2009) place social sustainability within the context of the working urban system of the city, explaining that the success of life in the city is only possible due to society cooperating to sustain each other, recognizing that the success of cities can be attributed to the collective effort of all of its citizens. Their definition is grounded in a social justice argument that seeks to address issues of social exclusion due to poor access to resources.

The spatial organization of resources within the built environment of cities can have a disempowering effect on particular social groups when they experience inequitable access to those very resources (Haughton & Hunter, 1994). Issues in spatial access to resources can be wide ranging, and can affect people positively or negatively due to locational advantage or disadvantage. Locational advantage refers to a place within the city that is geographically advantaging to those who live or work there, by virtue of the resources, services, and facilities that it contains (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Locational disadvantage accordingly refers to the absence of these resources in a particular place.

Locational advantage or disadvantage varies according to scale and accessibility; for example, a resident in a particular neighbourhood may be able to access resources that are geographically distant, but reasonably accessed by automobile. Access could be an issue for a resident living in the same neighbourhood if they must rely on public transit, which could be prohibitive or inconvenient in accessing the same resource. It is critical to understand access to resources both in terms of physical access as described above, but also in terms of social manifestations of access. Limited social access can refer to the inability to access resources due to prohibitive costs, prejudices within society that hinder access to resources by some social groups, or lack of social networks or social capital that inhibit an individual's ability to connect with particular resources (Fincher & Iveson, 2008).

Adopting a synthesis of each of these explanations, this paper puts forth a definition of urban social sustainability as being concerned with ensuring equitable access to the resources provided by a city that affect an individual's life chances, and subsequently their quality of life. Examples of these resources are listed below; the presence of these examples within communities can serve as indicators for their level of social sustainability. The examples provided below are not exhaustive, as there are many such resources that sustain a good quality of life which make communities and their residents successful. In general, if a particular resource is critical in affecting an individual's life chances at achieving a good quality of life, then that resource can be considered crucial in ensuring social sustainability.

These resources can include (but are not limited to) public infrastructure (such as transportation, public works), adequate and affordable housing, health care, safety and security, education, adequate employment opportunities to sustain an income outside of

poverty, and community facilities. They can also include access to less physically visible but equally important resources, such as the equitable access to a meaningful process of democracy and politics, the ability to participate and engage with government, the ability to organize, protest, and demonstrate, the right to access resources free of discrimination, and the ability to foster social capital through the creation and connection with local social networks. Democracy and citizen engagement are fundamental to ensuring social sustainability, as they allow citizens to be involved in the decision making process for issues that affect them. These processes provide a voice to citizens to ensure that government programs and policies are adequate in meeting the needs of the community. Just as important physical resources are for enhancing the quality of life for citizens, as too are the resources of civic engagement and democracy in ensuring that the right resources are being provided.

Why strive for social sustainability through planning practice?

Urban development of the past has traditionally been concerned with the provision of the 'basic necessity' type of services that were required for communities to function, including infrastructure such as water, roadways, sewage, electricity, and other such utilities. Eventually, the development of cities evolved when recognition emerged of the need for the separation of humans from incompatible land uses, such as toxic and polluting industry, signifying a growing understanding of the effects that land use planning can have on human quality of life (Hodge & Gordon, 2007) (Woolfe, 2004).

What this shift in urban planning demonstrated was a move from planning being predominantly concerned about the physical form and layout of communities in a technical

manner, to also concerning themselves with the social processes relating to the configuration between humans, land uses, and resources. There was a growing realization about the importance in integrating both the physical design needs of the city together with the social needs of the people. Research has indicated how physical form of cities strongly reflects the social structure and character of the local people, and that the rhythm of daily life has a direct influence on shaping the physical form of cities (Taylor & Burchfield, 2010). This can and should be considered both ways – as social processes shape the city, so too does the city shape the social processes that affect the daily lives of citizens.

As was discussed in the beginning of this paper, the social sustainability of cities (including Toronto) become jeopardized as disadvantaged communities are isolated away from the growth, development, and prosperity that are being primarily invested into the central core of the city. Fincher and Iveson (2008) argue that these spatial disparities exist due to unjust structures of distribution within the city, resulting in better access to the resources within a city for the higher income groups relative to lower income groups. They argue that this is significant for planners as they are a profession concerned with the spatial provision of resources. Urban planning can be a strong proponent for the attainment of social sustainability, in that it recognizes and is able to respond to issues of inequitable access to the cities resources by identifying communities of need, and proactively working to plan for the provision of resources to those identified resources.

There are elements of social justice that can be found within planning discourse which argue that the development of stable and resilient cities requires the recognition and surmounting of spatial injustices (Polese & Stren, 2000) (Fincher & Iveson, 2008) (Fainstein, 2005) (Manzi, Lucas, Jones, & Allen, 2010) (Roberts, 2003) (Sandercock, 1998).

Utilizing Henri Lefebvre's 'Right to the City' (1967), a concept later further developed by David Harvey (2008), an argument can be made about the need to increase fair access for a broader population to the best serviced neighbourhoods in Toronto, or to bring these services closer to the under serviced parts of the city. The right to the city concept argues that the success of the city is a result of the economy of the entire city as a whole, yet the prosperity that results from this success is disproportionately concentrated in the central city core (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Social sustainability would seek to address long term equity and social justice issues and trends, realizing how these issues threaten the sustainability of the vitality of a city in the long term.

In summary, as planning practise is concerned with the spatial organization of land uses and resources relative to human settlements, it is an effective proponent for ensuring that there is an equitable distribution of resources through the city. As social sustainability is achieved through ensuring the equitable access of resources, planning is thus capable at ensuring social sustainability with cities.

Chapter 3:

How governance dynamics affect social sustainability

For this chapter, the influence that local and provincial governance structures place on the ability for Toronto to be able to ensure and maintain social sustainability will be considered. Based on the definition of social sustainability as being based on the just city that ensures fair and equitable access to the city's resources, this chapter will examine the effect that the structure of governance impacts the ability of Toronto to strive for social sustainability.

The reconfiguring of local-provincial governance structures in Ontario

Governance relations between local, regional, provincial, and national levels are closely linked together by a system of federalism that is central to the Canadian political engine. In short, the sovereignty of Canada is divided amongst each of its provinces and territories. The Canadian Constitution provides legislative powers and tools for the provinces and territories to govern some aspects of their own local and regional matters. The provinces in turn grant municipalities with their own sets of legislative powers and tools to govern local matters. In Ontario, this transfer of jurisdictional authority is accomplished through the Municipal Act (and for Toronto, the City of Toronto Act), while particular powers and tools are authorized through specific acts, such as the *Planning Act*.

The relationship between the various levels of government has real and profound impacts on local social and economic issues. Thus, effectively addressing major local matters often requires the coordination and cooperation of multiple levels of government.

Provincial governments are very much responsible for setting the urban agenda of Canadian cities, and as has been demonstrated throughout time, make decisions that can have profound impacts on the ability and authority for municipalities to tackle their own local affairs (Bourdreau, Keil, & Young, 2009).

Frisken, Bourne, Gad, and Murdie (2000) argue that the Greater Toronto Area has experienced a relatively high level of social sustainability, largely in part to the organization of the provincial, regional, and local governance system in place. They point to research by Danielson (1976) which suggests that local municipal level governments seldom focus on addressing social issues that affect the less advantaged members of society, essentially because such initiatives are often costly, requiring tax increases that could potentially drive away middle class households who form a considerable share of municipal tax bases. As such, senior levels of government are often the institutions most likely to be responsible for promoting social sustainability efforts, thus making the relationship between provincial and municipal governments critical. (Frisken, Bourne, Gad, & Murdie, 2000).

In Ontario, the provincial government has given authority to a set of regional governments called upper-tier municipalities, and these upper-tier municipalities each contain a number of lower-tier municipalities within their jurisdiction. Upper-tier municipalities provide common regional services and infrastructure to their lower-tier municipalities, and are also the vehicle across which the provincial government promotes their social programs through (Sancton, 2000). In addition to savings from economies of scale for regional spending, part of the reason behind the creation of these regional levels of governments during the 1950s was to address the fragmented and inadequately serviced

urban development that had been occurring prior to the Second World War between Ontario municipalities (Taylor & Burchfield, 2010). It was also believed that greater equity could be reached by shared service delivery and tax sharing (Sancton, 2000). The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto served as the regional government for what were formerly the lower-tier municipalities of Toronto, Scarborough, North York, East York, York, and Etobicoke. The creation of a regional metropolitan government allowed for achieving relative success in the social sustainability of Toronto, by ensuring a reasonably uniform provision of services across the metropolitan area (Friskin, Bourne, Gad, & Murdie, 2000). Social sustainability across Metropolitan Toronto was improved by increasing resource access by a larger number of citizens within the regional area. Due to the implementation of the regional municipality, lower-tier municipalities with thriving industrial and commercial properties shared their higher tax revenue with the rest of the region (Kitchen, 2002). The pooling of tax revenue allowed for the construction of major infrastructure projects that could be shared by each of the lower-tier municipalities within the metropolitan area (Friskin, Bourne, Gad, & Murdie, 2000), thus creating access to resources to a greater number of citizens.

During the middle of the 1990s, a wave of neo-liberal reforms swept across Ontario and each of its municipalities, which is argued here to have undermined much of the progress to social sustainability that had been achieved since the formation of the regional government (Bourdreau, Keil, & Young, 2009). A major part of this reform included the amalgamation in 1998 of the six municipalities with the regional Metropolitan Toronto area into the single-tier City of Toronto municipality that exists today. Along with amalgamation, the province also downloaded the financial responsibility for social services

and transit onto the city's budget (Kitchen, 2002), while rescinding many of the powers for local municipalities to tax residents in order to pay for their new financial responsibilities (Bourdreau, Keil, & Young, 2009). Recalling the argument earlier that provincial and regional governments are in a better financial and authoritative position to administer social programs compared to local municipal governments (Danielson, 1976), the neoliberal reforms that occurred during the late 1990s played a major role in exacerbating the social disparities between polarized socioeconomic groups across the city, as senior levels of government were no longer funding social spending (Bourdreau, Keil, & Young, 2009).

Since amalgamation came with the caveat of provincial downloading, the potential for this governance restructuring to improve social sustainability was greatly compromised. Whether or not amalgamation was the right choice for Toronto is often a contentious debate, but with provincial downloading onto the city there is little doubt that amalgamation has been expensive for the City of Toronto, and that this has made ensuring social sustainability a more difficult challenge.

The effect of governance reforms on social sustainability in Toronto

Despite what should be a more effective arrangement for ensuring a high level of social sustainability, a growing number of research findings over the past decade have shown an increasing trend of spatial segregation between different socioeconomic groups within Toronto (Hulchanski, 2010; Bourne, 2007; Toronto Community Foundation, 2005; Murdie 1998). These research findings describe Toronto's neighbourhoods as becoming increasingly segregated by socioeconomic status – a trend that has been consistently

growing for 35 years and is manifesting as a city of 'haves' in the central core, and 'have nots' in the suburban parts of Toronto (Hulchanski, 2010). Hulchanski's research illustrates that Toronto's most locationally advantaged areas tend to be dominated by higher income groups, and also contain high ethnic homogeneity, lower educational attainment, and declining levels of immigrant settlers. Conversely, Toronto's locationally disadvantaged areas feature comparatively lower incomes, higher concentrations of poverty, higher ethnic diversity, lower educational attainment, and significantly increasing numbers of immigrant populations. Toronto has been, and continues to experience an unsustainable trend towards increasing spatial segregation between different socioeconomic groups within the city.

The problems that affect Toronto's suburbs are issues that have already been identified and discussed as far back as 1979 by Social Planning Toronto (then known as Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto). Their report, entitled *Metro's Suburbs in Transition*, discussed Toronto's suburbs as being increasingly composed of people for whom the post-war suburbs were not originally designed for:

"The post-war suburbs always included families and individuals whose life situations did not correspond to the prototype perceptions. But they were seen as exceptions to the general trend. Public frameworks of response which developed in suburban municipalities in the post-war period, were not particularly sensitive to the special needs of dependent social minorities. The exceptions to the prototype image started to increase. Social changes have come from within - youth, aging adults, family separation, women in the

labour force, mothers with grown children, unemployment - as they have come from without, in the varied backgrounds of new settlers in the last decade. The traditional suburban neighbourhood may remain physically intact, but it is no longer the same social environment as in earlier days."

(Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1979, p. 236)

Although the report described the suburbs and still physically intact, even at the time of the report there was evidence of emerging changes occurring in Toronto's suburbs. Planning in the past was not responsive to the needs of the social minorities of Toronto's suburbs, however as the social minorities became majorities; the suburbs saw an increase in high rise apartments and social housing to respond to that social demographic change.

Considering the growing segregation, one question to ask that is particular to Toronto is: has amalgamation contributed to the growing segregation within the city? The simple answer would be no, as Hulchanski's (2010) research describes a trend of spatial segregation that has been at least 35 years in the making - well before amalgamation took place. Have the City of Toronto's suburban areas (the former municipalities of Scarborough, North York, Etobicoke, York, East York) received an inequitable share of social service spending since amalgamation? The answer to this question is mixed, and was the topic of a study conducted by the City of Toronto entitled *Fair Share Scarborough*. The study found that Scarborough was receiving its fair share of funding for children's services, long-term care, road construction and maintenance, and social housing, yet the report was uncertain about the fairness of funding for other services such as homeless shelters,

libraries, parks and recreation, police services, waste and watershed services, and transit (City of Toronto, 2008).

It is unclear whether the lack of fair and adequate funding to suburban parts of Toronto is the cause of the growing spatial segregation, or whether provincial downloading is the culprit instead (although these issues have certainly intensified the problem). One of the issues often cited as having arisen as a result of amalgamation is the disconnection between City Hall and the suburban regions of Toronto as the former suburban City Halls were discontinued and moved to their new unified location downtown. Although the city has politically unified after amalgamation, the city remains divided in terms of containing a sense of a shared city, and the failure to address this division will threaten the social sustainability of Toronto moving forward. If amalgamation has truly created a disconnection between citizens and City Hall, this is an issue that undermines the ability for residents to access resources of democracy, thus becoming a threat to the city's social sustainability.

Evidence of this civic disconnection has not been substantiated by any legitimate survey of suburban Toronto residents. However, these opinions have been put forth in past community forum events (People Plan Toronto, 2008), have been argued in the media (James, 2008, 2010), and was part of a platform put forth by (unsuccessful) mayoral candidates during the 2010 Toronto municipal election (Moloney & Rider, 2010). Even the results of each of the past municipal elections since amalgamation helps describe this story; although the results do not explicitly imply that suburban residents feel disconnected, it does reveal something about the suburbs being a different place than the central parts of Toronto.

What is being suggested here is that this governance model is incomplete, and that a stronger connection will need to be made between the city level and the community level. This will be especially pertinent considering the major changes that will be necessary if Toronto is to address the issues that are facing its suburban communities today. Some of the plans suggested for dealing with the growing segregation in Toronto include high-rise tower retrofitting, the construction of new public transit lines, new affordable housing strategies, and alternative tenancy options such as secondary suites (Hulchanski, 2010). Without an adequate, effective, and legitimate process for engaging with communities, convincing suburban communities to make difficult changes could prove challenging for a City Hall that the suburbs do not feel particularly connected or engaged with.

Referring back to the *Metro's Suburbs in Transition* report, lessons can be learned about the importance of creating a more effective public framework for allowing citizens to engage with the planning of their neighbourhoods in order to make planning more responsive to the needs of the community:

"The message which emerges from this report is not an appeal for compassion for the needs of dependent social minorities, as might have been the case during earlier post-war suburban periods. It is a call for responsible public frameworks of policy, planning, and service provision which will address and respond to the special needs of the new social majority." (Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1979, p. 237)

Putting aside the debate about the pros and cons of Toronto's amalgamation, one of the issues that persists today, which is argued here has worsened since amalgamation, is the issue of effective citizen engagement into a democratic planning process. In order to ensure the attainment of true social sustainability in Toronto, there will need to be a consideration of how the current governance structure and planning process can be improved in order to better hear the voices of the members of the community. As was the lesson learned from the *Metro's Suburbs in Transition* report; considering the diversity of Toronto and subsequently its diverse set of needs, it is the local voice that will be critical in ensuring that the correct course of action is taken.

Chapter 4:

Current planning policies for promoting social sustainability

In this chapter, the present condition for the ability of planning policy and legislation to pursue goals of social sustainability in Toronto will be examined. It is crucial to consider this chapter in the context of the themes discussed in the previous chapters. In chapter 2, we explored how the social component developed out of the wider discourse on sustainability that originally emerged within the environmental movement. Here, we will examine how current planning policies respond to the challenges of sustainability. It will be explained that planning policies today contain implicit references to notions of environmental and economic sustainability, with little reference to social sustainability. This does not imply that current policy contains no discussion about social concerns; some social concerns are addressed in current planning policy, and were likely part of planning policy long before environmental policy goals. However, what will be argued here is that social concerns in planning policies are lacking and deficient, and that there is no language or goals aimed at attaining ongoing and long term social sustainability.

In chapter 3, the governance system in Ontario was examined and analyzed for its ability to serve as a vehicle for effective social sustainability. It was argued that the integrated system of governance between the province and its upper and lower-tier municipalities was an effective tool for pushing provincial interests to Ontario cities, and ensuring a relatively uniform level of social sustainability amongst its regions. In reflection of this well performing system, it will be suggested here that the province is not utilizing

this system to the fullest advantage in pushing municipalities to strive for social sustainability.

This chapter includes an evaluation and critique of planning policy. Planning policies alone are not responsible for the complete attainment of social sustainability, there are in fact many other policies and programs that each contribute to ensuring a more socially sustainable city. However, for the purposes of this paper, only pertinent planning policies will be considered here. Following a critique of planning policy, recommendations will be provided about how these policy documents can be improved to better serve the needs of a socially sustainable city.

Provincial planning policy responses to social sustainability

As discussed in the previous chapter, municipalities in Canada are “creatures of the province” – that is, their roles, responsibilities, and legal authorities are set out by their respective provincial governments. In Ontario, legal planning authority is transferred from the province to the municipalities through the *Planning Act*, giving them autonomous control over local city planning matters. The *Planning Act* provides both general and specific regulations, laying down the guidelines for municipal planning in Ontario, and requiring municipalities to formulate their own Official Plans and zoning by-laws. Among many statements, the *Planning Act* explains that planning matters in Ontario shall have regard to matters of provincial interest, including “the adequate provision and distribution of educational, health, social, cultural and recreational facilities” (*Planning Act*, 1993). Thus, at the very top level of planning legislation, it is mandated that resources be

adequately provided and distributed throughout the region. The *Planning Act* however does not get into specifics such as what entails adequacy.

The *Planning Act* also provides legal authority to the *Provincial Policy Statement* (PPS), stating that all land use planning activities, including municipal Official Plans, “shall be consistent with” the PPS (Planning Act, 1993). As such, the PPS is the province’s primary tool for administering provincial planning interests, requiring that provincial interests are met at the city level. There are three primary areas of interest outlined in the PPS – each of the three will be examined here with respect to their commitment to achieving sustainability in Ontario municipalities.

The first section, ‘Building Strong Communities’ contains plenty of strong language referencing the principles of sustainability. This includes promoting efficient and diverse land uses, providing affordable housing, ensuring an appropriate mix of housing and employment, and encouraging density and intensification (Government of Ontario, 2005). There are specific references made ensuring that development does not produce negative effects to the environment or to air quality, or contribute negatively to climate change. In some cases the language can be especially specific, as is the case within sections 1.7 and 1.8. Section 1.7 ‘Long-Term Economic Prosperity’ is specifically devoted to ensuring economic sustainability, while Section 1.8 ‘Energy and Air Quality’ contains strong support for environmental sustainability. For example, section 1.8.1 contains specific language encouraging planning that makes use of renewable energy sources:

“promote design and orientation which maximize the use of alternative or renewable energy, such as solar and wind energy, and the mitigating effects of vegetation” (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 14)

Section 1.8.2 is also particularly specific:

“Increased energy supply should be promoted by providing opportunities for energy generation facilities to accommodate current and projected needs, and the use of renewable energy systems and alternative energy systems, where feasible.” (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 14)

‘Building Strong Communities’ contains policy that strives for the attainment of social sustainability as well, however they does not reach the same level of consideration given to economic and environmental sustainability, as demonstrated by the very specific language used in the instances mentioned above. For example, section 1.1.1 states that strong communities will be sustained by “ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs” (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 4). There is no discussion about the provision of these services in an equitable manner that strives to share access to resources to all communities within the city, thus failing to ensure the social sustainability of the entire city. Section 1.1.1 and 1.4.3 contain statements ensuring that land use is planned keeping in mind the physical accessibility of persons with disabilities, the ‘elderly’, and residents with special needs,

however there is no discussion about the social needs of citizens (Government of Ontario, 2005).

Some policies within the PPS discuss strategies for improving the quality of life of citizens through by ensuring the provision of resources such as housing. Although the entirety of Section 1.4 deals with housing, only 1.4.3 focuses on social sustainability through the provision of affordable housing, calling for municipalities to set their own affordable housing targets to provide for “low and moderate income households” (Government of Ontario, 2005). Unlike sections 1.7 and 1.8, there is no specific guidelines about how affordable housing is to be obtained, nor are any tools provided for determining what an adequate affordable housing supply for a given municipality should be, and how targets should be set and met. The 1989 iteration of the PPS stated that municipalities were expected to accommodate 25% of all affordable housing within new developments; however this statement was removed with the subsequent 1996 revision, and later replaced with the language used in the current 2005 PPS (Gladki & Pomeroy, 2007). It is understandable why the province opted for removing the specific target of 25%; this is a somewhat arbitrary target that doesn’t take into account variation in real estate markets across different Ontario municipalities. However, the removal of specific targets consequentially also results in the lack of accountability for municipalities in ensuring a truly adequate affordable housing supply.

The next two major areas of the PPS include section 2.0 ‘Wise Use and Management of Resources’, and 3.0 ‘Protecting public health and safety’; each contain policies that are more aligned with achieving environmental and economic sustainability. The second section, ‘Wise Use & Management of Resources’, is aimed at protecting the natural

environment, land resources including agricultural lands, mines, and aggregate sites, water resources and cultural heritage sites (Government of Ontario, 2005). The primary focus of this section is in ensuring the economic sustainability of Ontario's environment for resource extraction, with a secondary emphasis on the protection of the natural landscape for the sake of environmental sustainability. The third and last major section, 'Protecting public health and safety', focuses on strategies for protecting public health, protecting communities from being located in proximity to land uses that are hazardous to human health (Government of Ontario, 2005).

What this evaluation of the PPS reveals is that while its commitment to sustainability is never truly explicit, it still contains a strong support placing an emphasis on planning for economic and environmental sustainability, and much less so on social sustainability. There is little to no language in the PPS that directly addresses social equity issues that manifest themselves in land use planning. This is not surprising however, considering the general lack of many other North American governments in responding to the social aspects of sustainability (Saha & Patterson, 2008).

Although the PPS is the province's primary instrument for undertaking their planning objectives, the *Planning Act* also states that planning decisions must also be consistent with the policies set out in "provincial plans", namely the *Greenbelt Plan*, the *Niagara Escarpment Plan*, the *Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan*, and the growth plans implemented under the *Places to Grow Act* (Planning Act, 1993). The *Greenbelt Plan*, the *Niagara Escarpment Plan*, and the *Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan*, each seek to protect natural environment lands from being encroached on by development, to ensure we continue to conserve a degree of our natural environments, while concentrating and

intensifying within existing municipal boundaries whenever possible. These plans are predominantly focused on the protection of the environment, and it is appropriate that they each focus predominantly on aspects of environmental aspects of sustainability.

The *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe*, created under the *Places to Grow Act*, sets population and employment growth targets across the province, and encourages the use of smart growth strategies for achieving these targets (Government of Ontario, 2006). The *Growth Plan* not only operates to set growth targets, but also functions as a growth management strategy that outlines what infrastructure and services municipalities should be planning for to adequately serve the population as it continues to grow. As part of its vision statement, the *Growth Plan* describes the GGH as being supported by the three pillars of sustainability:

"More than anything, the *Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH)*, will be a great place to live in 2031. Its communities will be supported by the pillars of a strong economy, a clean and healthy environment and social equity."
(Government of Ontario, 2006, p. 9)

While the *Growth Plan* does not make many explicit references to sustainability throughout the document, it does contain language that strongly supports planning for a sustainable future. Unlike the PPS, the *Growth Plan* fares somewhat better at considering the social equity aspects of sustainability. For example, chapter 3 'Infrastructure to Support Growth', section 3.2.6 'Community Infrastructure', discusses the need to attain complete communities to meet the evolving needs of Ontarians (Government of Ontario, 2006). It

also discusses the need for an appropriate affordable housing strategy, although this does not provide any new direction not already offered by the PPS. Although the Growth Plan sometimes discusses social sustainability or equity in its vision statements, there are no specific policies or tools within the document aimed at specifically seeking socially sustainable growth, or at ensuring an equitable distribution of resources.

Municipal planning policy responses to social sustainability

The primary planning policies at the municipal level are found in their Official Plan, which are required to be created by Ontario municipalities under the *Planning Act*. Official Plans contain policy statements that set the goals and priorities for managing and directing urban development and other physical change to the urban form of the city. These documents are often regarded as the blueprint for how and where a city will grow, and provide direction for where the city wants to end up. All zoning by-laws in the city must conform to the policies in the Official Plan, and the Official Plan itself must conform to the Provincial Policy Statement, reinforcing the importance of the relationship between these two policy documents. For the purposes of this paper, Toronto's Official Plan will be critiqued for the level of its ability to respond to issues of sustainability, particularly social sustainability.

Compared to the provincial planning policies, Toronto's Official Plan performs much better at discussing policy that refers to sustainability. The Official Plan is explicit about its commitment early on in the document, discussing the need to plan for intra and intergenerational sustainability:

“Building a successful Toronto means that we have to make sustainable choices about how we grow. We have to see connections and understand the consequences of our choices. We have to integrate environmental, social, and economic perspectives in our decision making. We have to meet the needs of today without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.” (City of Toronto, 2007, p. 10)

Additional mentions of sustainability are found throughout the Official Plan, however every reference to sustainability found in the policy statements are always associated with the environment, while none refer to social sustainability. As was discussed in chapter 2, this is likely explained by the prevalence of the concept and discourse on sustainability as typically being associated with the environment.

The Official Plan does contain some policies that reference some of the ideas associated with achieving social sustainability, mostly dealing with the provision of social housing, but also a few involving the development of social infrastructure such as community facilities and social services (City of Toronto, 2007). The theme of social equity and equality can be found in only one policy statement, discussing the need for “Adequate and equitable access to community services and local institutions” (City of Toronto, 2007, p. 3.18). Perhaps the strongest statement about a commitment to equity comes in a policy statement about the planning process, explaining that the Official Plan review, including subsequent amendments, must contain a “fair, open, and accessible public process” (City of Toronto, 2007, p. 5.18).

Although the Official Plan does contain policies that refer to aspects related to social sustainability, there are no explicit policies about ensuring the ongoing, long term social development of the city. The City of Toronto has produced an excellent strategy for achieving social sustainability in the city called *A Social Development Strategy for the City of Toronto*, but this document is not a planning document, nor is it a policy document and thus does not carry the same weight as an Official Plan which provides legislative power to the city concerning the future of Toronto's change.

As mentioned in the previous section, it is imperative that planners begin to more explicitly embrace the concept of social sustainability – this should involve policies that are included in their city's Official Plan document. Understandably, this is tough for municipalities, as the province does not provide much guidance, tools, or strategies to assist in social development for their municipalities, nor does it compel them to consider social sustainability under the PPS. Since Official Plans must have regard to provincial policy documents, a stronger set of policies put forth by the province could be successful at demanding planners to plan for a more socially sustainable city. Recommendations for these such policy changes will be discussed in the next section.

Recommendations for planning policy improvements

As has been demonstrated above, the system of planning in Ontario is tightly integrated from the provincial level right down to the municipality. Since municipal planning policies must 'have regard to' provincial planning policies, a stronger set of policy language supporting the fostering of social sustainability at the provincial level is key to ensuring municipal level planning policies geared towards social sustainability. It is expected that

by creating policies in the PPS that are more respective of social sustainability, that these policies will trickle down to the various other policy documents that must 'have regard to' the PPS, including municipal Official Plans as well as provincial Growth Plans.

The first and foremost section of the PPS is concerned with 'Building Strong Communities'. As goals of sustainability are aimed at ensuring the long-term building of strong communities, this section should contain stronger language directly positioned to ensure the ability of all communities to sustain themselves economically, environmentally, and socially. The PPS, in describing the need for 'Building Strong Communities', begins in section 1.1 by describing how to achieve "Healthy, liveable and safe communities" through the "Managing and Directing of Land Use to Achieve Efficient Development and Land Use Patterns" (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 4). The first policy sub clause describes the need for "promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term" (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 4). In order to embrace the importance for all forms of sustainability, this statement should be amended to include not just financial well-being, but the social and environmental well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term. Similarly, the statement about "avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns;" (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 4) should be amended to also include social concerns as well.

The policy statement that explains the need for "ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs" (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 4) should be amended to include the need to ensure the *equitable* distribution of necessary infrastructure and public service

facilities. This change will provide communities of increased need with the power to demand that they receive a more fair and equitable share of municipal resources.

The same section also describes the need for “improving accessibility for persons with disabilities and the elderly by removing and/or preventing land use barriers which restrict their full participation in society” (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 4). The Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC) suggests that this statement be improved to include other forms of land use barriers that are not solely based on physical discrimination (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2011). The OHRC explains that there are forms of discrimination other than physical. For example, NIMBY-ism against the construction of affordable housing is a form of social discrimination that is a land use barrier for those who rely on affordable housing (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2011). As such, it is recommended that this statement be amended to include groups that face social discrimination barriers. Referring back to the definition of social sustainability as addressing issues of both physical and less-physical social access to resources, this statement would serve to address both forms of access.

Section 1.4.3, which is part of the ‘Housing’ section, should be rewritten to once again include more stringent mandates for the provision of affordable housing. At present, municipalities are required to set their own targets for affordable housing units (Government of Ontario, 2005). This system needs to be amended to ensure that the targets set for municipalities are adequate to meet the demand for affordable housing within their city. The Wellesley Institute, a Toronto based think tank focusing on urban health issues, recommends that targets set by municipalities be determined by a set of rules created by the province, or alternatively that the province itself should be responsible

for setting these targets (Wellesley Institute, 2010). The Wellesley Institute also suggest that the policy statement be changed from the current language of “affordable to low and moderate income households” (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 9), as they argue that this encourages the development of housing at the existing low end of the private housing market, excluding households that are not able to afford even lower market end housing. They suggest the language be changed to also include the provision of “below-market housing”, aimed at expanding the price range of affordable housing to be more accessible to lower income households (Wellesley Institute, 2010).

Section 1.6, which is concerned with ‘Infrastructure and Public Service Facilities’, contains policies central to ensuring the provision of resources to citizens (Government of Ontario, 2005). Sub clause 1.6.3 discusses the need for the strategic placement of infrastructure and public service facilities in order to “support the effective and efficient delivery of emergency management services”, and also to “promote cost-effectiveness and facilitate service integration” (Government of Ontario, 2005, p. 10). A further statement should be adjoined to this sub clause to discuss the need for infrastructure and public service facilities to be *equitably* and strategically located to match the needs of all communities within the city.

What each of these amendments to the PPS accomplishes is placing a greater importance on social issues, including issues of access to resources, and issues of the equitable distribution of resources such as infrastructure. By having planning conform to these policies, there will be a greater emphasis and stronger language intended to make cities planned to be more equitable, to ensure greater access to resources, to distribute resources better, and thus to improve the social sustainability of cities.

Chapter 5:

Strengthening social sustainability through improved citizen discourse

This chapter considers some of the issues described in the previous chapters, including the sense of disconnection experienced by suburban residents following the occurrence of amalgamation. It also considers that despite many of the pressing issues affecting Toronto today, including the increasing trends of poverty or the lack of higher-order transit across the city, there is no legitimate or meaningful forum for citizens to discuss, become informed, and get engaged with the issues affecting their communities. This chapter thus examines the need for a more effective process of civic engagement, and suggests some models for how this could be accomplished.

The need for a more effective citizen engagement process

“Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody” – Jane Jacobs (*The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 1961, p. 238)

Toronto is often called a city of neighbourhoods, describing the unique character of the many distinct neighbourhoods within the city. Considering how diverse Toronto is, in terms of its numerous ethnicities and cultures, its wide ranging socioeconomic statuses, and the many varied lifestyles, it is curious how planners would be able to plan for the city's many different communities without an effective community level governance system. Due to the city being so diverse, a strong community engagement process could

prove quite challenging, yet at the same time having a diverse city gives more reason for why Toronto needs to listen to its citizen's more closely.

As was mentioned in the *Metro's Suburbs in Transition* (Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1979) report earlier in this paper, there is a strong need for public frameworks of planning to be able to effectively respond to the changes in demographics and the evolving needs of the citizens, in order to continue to be sustainable for the city's residents. Early on in this paper, reasons were also alluded to as to why the City of Toronto, and particularly their planners, will need to adopt a stronger model for civic engagement and communicative planning if they are to address some of the ever more pressing issues of growing inequity occurring throughout the city. It was suggested that without an effective process for engaging with communities, convincing suburban residents to make difficult changes will prove problematic for City Hall.

There are three reasons why a lack of a good civic engagement process could pose a problem. The first is the sense of disconnect that suburban residents – that is, the residents of the former municipalities of Scarborough, North York, East York, York, and Etobicoke – feel from City Hall as their local government. As was mentioned before, this claim would greatly benefit from a more valid substantiation through a survey of Toronto suburban residents. However, these opinions have been indicated in the past through community forum events (People Plan Toronto, 2008), have been argued in the media (James, 2008, 2010), and was part of a platform put forth by (unsuccessful) mayoral candidates during the 2010 Toronto municipal election (Moloney & Rider, 2010). The loss of democracy following amalgamation was also part of the cause behind the Citizens for Local Democracy movement that occurred prior to amalgamation, which was headed by former Toronto

mayor John Sewell (Bourdreau, Keil, & Young, 2009). A strong engagement process could help to reduce this sense of disconnection, by providing a local forum for discussing community issues, where concerns could collectively be taken directly to City Hall.

A second reason why Toronto needs to produce a better engagement process has to do with the potential for inter-community conflict and NIMBY-ism to threaten the necessary change and evolution that our city - particularly our inner suburbs - will require in the coming years. Toronto truly is diverse and this is the case right down to the neighbourhood level, so much that even within communities themselves, there can be stark contrasts between the socioeconomic levels of its residents. As the Metropolitan Toronto government slowly evolved to match the change in the social composition of its city, the suburbs saw a growth in the number of high rise apartments that were constructed beside the already existent single-family detached houses built during the post-war period (Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1979). Although Toronto's suburbs contain the entirety of the city's identified priority neighbourhoods and are the location of the majority of the income declining neighbourhoods identified by Hulchanski (2010), it should not be assumed that these communities are socioeconomically homogenous as purely low-income. They are in fact quite diverse, with lower-income households living within the same neighbourhood of middle or higher-income households. An effective community engagement model could serve to mediate differences within the community (Altrows, 2009), and also to educate the community as to why such changes are critical to the sustainability of both the neighbourhood and the entire city.

A third reason for Toronto to consider a more meaningful civic engagement process is more directly related to the fact that our communities are highly diverse. A strong

community engagement method ensures that the need of the citizens are adequately being met, validated through the suggestions made directly by citizens through the engagement process. It is not acceptable for only the voices of the already politically mobilized to be part of the planning and development of cities, even if their voices are advocating for the needs of the disadvantaged members of society. This can lead to assumptions made about what the needs of disadvantaged communities are, and assumptions about how to address those needs (Fincher & Iveson, 2008). Sandercock (1998) argues that this mode of thinking is part of the problem that occurred with 1960s urban renewal projects, where paternalistic planning authorities prescribed plans that were out of touch with many of the needs of the residents within the community.

An example of a project intended to address some of the issues affecting Toronto's high rise towers include the city's Tower Renewal initiative (City of Toronto, 2010). This project will require intense amounts of work and capital, and should bring considerable change to city's suburbs. At the same time, they are a project which focuses entirely on revitalizing apartment blocks, seemingly offering little benefit to the neighbouring single-detached households. With such a significant amount of change planned for the high rise areas of the suburbs (City of Toronto, 2010) that has the potential for drastically changing the appearance of the community for the low-rise non-tower households as well, there is risk of public backlash in the form of NIMBY-ism from those who do not see the benefit in spending tax dollars for the improvement of our towers, or those who do not want to see the intensification of their suburban communities.

The Tower Renewal initiative is but one of a list of ideas still being planned for Toronto's suburbs. The other major project involved the construction of a cross-city

network of light-rail transit lines named Transit City. As of the beginning of 2011, the future of Transit City was put into question as Toronto's newly elected mayor Rob Ford made one of his first points of business to put a halt to its progress (Hume, 2010). The point behind the fate of Transit City here is to question how this situation might have been different if the city engaged in a stronger community engagement process with residents concerning the construction of the LRT. Following the threat of Transit City's cancellation, a number of citizen-led efforts emerged throughout the city and in online social networks to rally support for saving the project, demonstrating support for the project by an organized group of citizens (Save Transit City website, 2010) (TTCRiders.ca, 2010). This support may have been able to be harnessed prior to the threat of Transit City's cancellation, if the City of Toronto had proactively led this campaign themselves, and had focused more effort into generating community buy-in for the project by doing more to involve citizens in the process.

The argument here is that a strong community engagement model is crucial in order to generate buy-in for many of the initiatives that may be necessary to address social issues within the city. The future vitality of the city can be threatened if the citizens are unwilling to permit many of the changes that are aimed at addressing issues of sustainability in Toronto. It is also crucial for this engagement process to generate a city-wide discourse about the issues currently affecting Toronto's communities. This would allow citizens to be educated, engaged, and provide feedback into some of Toronto's pressing issues, including its growing poverty problem, its need for a better transit system, or the need to make their communities more sustainable. The next section argues that a strong civic engagement method is necessary in order to better ensure that citizens get involved in supporting the

initiatives that they care about, and that can have a profound impact on improving the sustainability of their neighbourhoods, by allowing their communities to evolve to better respond to their need to become more sustainable.

Creating community level governance for Toronto's social sustainability

Taking into consideration an argument for the creation of a new and more effective means of community engagement system in Toronto, what could such a system look like, and how could it be implemented? This section does not delve into methods of community engagement itself, but rather argues that a community level of governance is critical for the social sustainability of Toronto's neighbourhoods.

As it stands today, Toronto features four Community Councils, which at present is considered the most local level of government in the city closest to the actual communities and its citizens, although these councils carry little political authority or power. The four councils are located across the city; one in each of Scarborough, North York, and Etobicoke, while downtown Toronto and East York feature a combined council (City of Toronto, n.d.). The councils were established in 1997 under the City of Toronto Act, and are intended to provide a forum for local input into the City of Toronto's decision-making process (City of Toronto, n.d.). These councils do not contain legislative power, but instead discuss local matters and make recommendations for decisions to be made when they reconvene with City Council at City Hall (City of Toronto, n.d.). Although these councils represent a more local geography, their monthly meetings are consistently held at 9:30AM during weekday mornings (see City of Toronto website for schedules), making them inaccessible to working members of the community.

A few alternatives to Toronto's current municipal governance model, including its methods for local community engagement, have been proposed by various groups and individuals since amalgamation occurred in the city. The Governing Toronto Advisory Panel, created in 2005 by Toronto City Council, was assigned to provide recommendations on Toronto's governance structure in anticipation of the power to reform its governance that the city would be granted under the revised 2006 City of Toronto Act (City of Toronto, n.d.). As part of their response to council, one of their recommendations was for the further empowerment of the current Community Councils (Governing Toronto Advisory Panel, 2005). Recognizing the underutilization of these Community Councils, the report recommends for a delegation of increased powers to the Community Councils, and calls for a discussion on a more engaging means of gathering local neighbourhood input into civic issues. Placing an increased importance on these Councils is seen by the Panel as one method of strengthening the relationship and connection between City Hall and its residents in a more systematic way, as opposed to the tokenistic Community Councils as they are presently configured (Governing Toronto Advisory Panel, 2005).

Other more recent suggestion seeks a model that is even closer to residents at the neighbourhood level than the Community Councils are at present. Citizen based organization People Plan Toronto has suggested the creation of 'Neighbourhood Action Councils' (NACs), an idea that resulted as part of an event they organized in September of 2010 entitled 'A City for Everyone' (People Plan Toronto, 2010). The organization envisions these NACs as a way for citizens to feel a greater sense of connection and belonging to their city and to the planning process, to ensure that their own local neighbourhood visions are considered by Toronto municipal planners, and to create a

sense of a shared city amongst its citizens (People Plan Toronto, 2010). This last aspect is particularly critical for the social sustainability of a diverse city such as Toronto, to help citizens to realise that investment in their city benefits everyone, and that everyone deserves to be benefitted. Creating a shared city could be crucial for ensuring public buy-in for large, city-wide projects, and for preventing such projects from being stopped by NIMBY type protesting.

Another recent proposal for Toronto governance reform, and perhaps the most comprehensive to date, has been put forth by former Toronto chief planner Paul Bedford, who presented his idea during a speech entitled 'Rethinking Toronto's Governance' in September of 2010 at the University of Toronto's Munk Centre (Bedford, 2010). One aspect of his speech involved calling for the creation of 'neighbourhood advisory councils', an idea he bases off of New York City's model of community boards.

New York City's model consists of 59 community level councils called community boards (one for each community district – New York's version of Toronto's ward system), which from a top-down perspective breaks a large and diverse city into smaller, more manageable pieces. Each community board consists of non-elected members who must live, work, or have some vested interest in the local community (The City of New York, 2010). Proposals for new developments, including potential zoning or plan amendments, must be presented to the community board before formal reviews begin (Bedford, 2010). Community boards do not contain the authority to approve plans or make decisions on local matters, instead serving in an advisory role to the city (The City of New York, 2010), similar in function to Toronto's Community Councils. However, the community boards provide a formal community level government officially recognized by the city, consist of

members who are in touch with local needs and who are willing to offer proactive views about community matters, and match these engaged citizens together with local elected councillors and city staff such as planners (The City of New York, 2010). Community boards hold public hearings to discuss local budget needs which are submitted to New York's Office of Management and Budget for consideration (The City of New York, 2010). They also produce 'Community District Needs Assessments', which describe current and future needs, as well as provide recommendations for programs or projects to address those needs, which are submitted for consideration to the Department of City Planning (The City of New York, 2010).

Bedford's suggestion outlines the creation of a similar system of community boards across the City of Toronto. His version, which he calls neighbourhood advisory councils, would consist and be run by members of the neighbourhood, and would include local councillors, business leaders, and others with a vested interest in the community. Planning decisions would be taken to the local level, and meetings would be held on a regular basis for the community to consider planning applications, local budget investments, and to provide a place to voice local concerns directly to City Hall. These councils will serve to help reconnect local communities to City Hall, especially many of the inner suburban communities who lost their local City Hall when it became amalgamated and moved downtown. The councils will also serve to address the fact that Toronto is diverse, by providing a forum to receive the input of the many of our diverse communities.

The creation of a community level of governance has the potential for greatly increasing the conditions necessary for improving social sustainability in Toronto. Due to the fact that the city is diverse, a local neighbourhood council would allow the City of

Toronto to gauge the needs right across the city, making the city more efficient at matching services to the specific needs of the community. More crucially, local neighbourhood councils would allow the citizens to engage in a discourse about each of the issues currently affecting Toronto. A more informed public would better be able to make the right decisions and demand the changes necessary to ensure the continued vitality, success, and sustainability of their communities.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This paper opens up by recognizing the diversity of Toronto, and also recognizing some of the challenges to achieving social sustainability that has occurred as a result of its diversity. It is first argued that in order to strive for the social sustainability of the city, we need to adopt a model of achieving a just city that endeavours to ensure the equitable access of resources by all members of the city. This model is preferred over other, more commonly practised strategies that attempt to address social goals through fostering social mix between different socioeconomic groups.

The evolution of the concept of social sustainability was explored out of its emergence from within the larger concept of sustainability. It was demonstrated that social sustainability is an effective model for understanding how the city changes, for understanding how the city affects a diverse population, and for understanding the social needs of its citizens. It was argued that planning as a profession is in a position to actively promote social sustainability, and thus planners should strive to ensure that the city grows in an equitable and sustainable manner.

Through an examination of planning policy, this paper describes the general lack of provisions or conditions in current planning policy for ensuring a more socially sustainable future in Ontario municipalities, including Toronto. Although the City of Toronto's Official Plan does make reference to equity and inclusiveness, these policies are very few in number. It was explained that research has indicated that municipal governments in general do not strive for addressing social goals, due to the costly nature of providing social services, programs, infrastructure, and other such resources. Instead, it is senior levels of

government that are often responsible and more capable of administering and delivering services that ensure social sustainability. Part of the problem for Ontario municipalities in attaining social sustainability then, has been the downloading or elimination of social spending by the province. Another part is the lack of a presence of policy language that supports social sustainability in the provincial level planning policy documents. It is suggested that the province needs to get back into taking a more proactive and demanding role of its cities for addressing social concerns – both by setting targets for initiatives such as affordable housing, but also by once again assuming the responsibility for social spending, or at least providing cities with more adequate tools for raising municipal finances.

Another problem that was examined in this paper is the lack of discourse occurring within the city about some of the major issues within the city, including the growing suburban poverty problem, or the lack of higher-order transit across the city. This paper suggests that as a first step, it would be beneficial to create a more local community level of governance that both allows for this type of discussion to occur, but that also gives citizens the chance to provide input and voice concerns about the issues that affect their community.

Achieving social sustainability in Toronto will require a combination of some of the efforts described in this paper, and will also require efforts for achieving social sustainability not directly related to planning. However, as was argued in this paper, planners are in a position to make a strong impact on the sustainability of cities, including their social sustainability as well. Planning for social sustainability is not only important to address the social concerns of the city, it is imperative for the continued success of Toronto.

Bibliography

1. Altrows, L. (2009, January). Principles of community development. *Lecture, PL8312 - Community Development*. Toronto: Ryerson University.
2. Arthurson, K. (2002). Creating inclusive communities through balancing social mix: A critical relationship or tenuous link? *Urban Policy and Research*, 20(3).
3. August, M. (2008, Summer). Social Mix and Canadian Public Housing Redevelopment: Experiences in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(1), 82-101.
4. Bedford, P. (2010). City Planning in the Big Apple. *Ontario Planning Journal*, 20-22.
5. Bedford, P. (2010, September 15). Rethinking Toronto's Governance. *Presented at Jane Jacob's Awards ceremony*. Toronto: Institute for Municipal Finance & Governance, Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto.
6. Bourdreau, J.-A., Keil, R., & Young, D. (2009). *Changing Toronto: Governing Urban Neoliberalism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
7. Bourne, L. (2007). *New Urban Divides: How economic, social, and demographic trends are creating new sources of urban difference in Canada*. University of Toronto, Centre for Urban and Community Studies: Research Bulletin #33. Toronto: University of Toronto.
8. Bramley, G., & Power, S. (2009). Urban form and social sustainability: the role of density and housing type. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 36, 30-48.
9. City of Toronto. (2001). *Social Development Strategy*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
10. City of Toronto. (2007). *Regent Park Social Development Plan (Staff Report)*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
11. City of Toronto. (2007). *Toronto Official Plan*. Toronto: City Planning Division.
12. City of Toronto. (2008). *Fair Share Scarborough*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
13. City of Toronto. (2010). *Lawrence Allen Revitalization Plan (Staff Report)*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
14. City of Toronto. (2010). *Toronto Elections, Mayor, 2010 Poll by Poll Results*. Retrieved April 1, 2011, from City of Toronto website: <http://www.toronto.ca/elections/results/pdf/2010-mayor.pdf>
15. City of Toronto. (2010). *Tower Renewal Implementation Book*. Toronto: City of Toronto.

16. City of Toronto. (n.d.). *Background (Governing Toronto)*. Retrieved March 2, 2011, from City of Toronto official website: <http://www.toronto.ca/governingtoronto/background.htm>
17. City of Toronto. (n.d.). *City of Toronto: Office of Equity, Diversity, and Human Rights*. Retrieved April 7, 2011, from City of Toronto website: <http://www.toronto.ca/diversity/>
18. City of Toronto. (n.d.). *Community Councils*. Retrieved March 2, 2011, from City of Toronto official website: http://www.toronto.ca/committees/community_councils.htm
19. Cole, I., & Goodchild, B. (2001). Social Mix and the 'Balanced Community' in British housing policy – a tale of epochs. *Geojournal*, 17(1), 351-360.
20. Danielson, M. N. (1976). *The Politics of Exclusion*. New York: Columbia University Press.
21. Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 31, 331-338.
22. Dempsey, N., Bramley, G., Power, S., & Brown, C. (2009). The Social Dimension of Sustainable Development: Defining Urban Social Sustainability. *Sustainable Development*, 10.1002/sd.417.
23. Edwards, A. R. (2005). *The sustainability revolution: Portrait of a paradigm shift*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.
24. Fainstein, S. S. (2005). Cities and Diversity: Should We Want It? Can We Plan For It? *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(1), 3-19.
25. Fincher, R., & Iveson, K. (2008). *Planning and Diversity in the City: Redistribution, Recognition and Encounter*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
26. Frisken, F., Bourne, L., Gad, G., & Murdie, R. A. (2000). Governance and Social Sustainability: The Toronto Experience. In M. Polese, & R. Stren, *The Social Sustainability of Cities: Diversity and the Management of Change* (pp. 68-97). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
27. Galster, G., Andersson, R., & Musterd, S. (2010). Who Is Affected by Neighbourhood Income Mix? Gender, Age, Family, Employment and Income Differences. *Urban Studies*, 47(14), 2915-2944.
28. Gladki, J., & Pomeroy, S. (2007). *Implementing Inclusionary Policy to Facilitate Affordable Housing Development in Ontario*. Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association.
29. Governing Toronto Advisory Panel. (2005). *The City We Want - The City We Need: The Report of the Governing Toronto Advisory Panel*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
30. Government of Ontario. (2005). *Provincial Policy Statement*. Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
31. Government of Ontario. (2006). *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe*. Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal. Queen's Printer for Ontario.
32. Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 53, 23-40.

33. Haughton, G., & Hunter, C. (1994). *Sustainable Cities*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
34. Hodge, G., & Gordon, D. (2007). *Planning Canadian Communities* (5th ed.). Nelson.
35. Hulchanski, J. D. (1989). Planning New Urban Neighbourhoods: Lessons from Toronto's St. Lawrence Neighbourhood. In D. L. Gordon (Ed.), *Directions for New Urban Neighbourhoods: Learning from St. Lawrence* (pp. 3.2 - 3.10). Toronto: Ryerson Polytechnical Institute.
36. Hulchanski, J. D. (2010). The Three Cities Within Toronto: Income Polarization Among Toronto's Neighbourhoods, 1970-2000. *Centre for Urban & Community Studies, Research Bulletin #41*.
37. Hume, C. (2010, December 1). Hume: Ford to Transit City: Drop dead. *The Toronto Star*.
38. Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.
39. James, R. (2008, January 1). Amalgamation: 10 years later. *The Toronto Star*.
40. James, R. (2010, September 15). Toronto 'too little' and 'too big'. *The Toronto Star*.
41. Jarvis, H., Pratt, A. C., & Cheng-Chong, P. W. (2001). *The Secret Life of Cities: The Social Reproduction of Everyday Life*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
42. Kitchen, H. M. (2002). *Canadian Tax Paper No. 107: Municipal Revenue and Expenditure Issues in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Tax Foundation.
43. Lees, L. (2008). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance? *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2449-2470.
44. Lefebvre, H. (1967). *Le Droit à la ville*.
45. Manzi, T., Lucas, K., Jones, T. L., & Allen, J. (2010). *Social Sustainability in Urban Areas: Communities, Connectivity, and Urban Fabric*. Sterling: Earthscan.
46. McKenzie, S. (2004). *Social Sustainability: Towards Some Definitions*. Hawke Research Institute, Working Paper Series No. 27. Magill: University of South Australia.
47. Moloney, P., & Rider, D. (2010, October 7). Sewell to head reform panel if Smitherman is elected. *The Toronto Star*.
48. Murdie, R. (1998). The Welfare State, Economic Restructuring, and Immigrant Flows: Impacts on socio-spatial segregation in Greater Toronto. In S. Musterd, & W. Ostendorf, *Urban Segregation and the Welfare State: Inequality and Exclusion in Western Cities* (pp. 64-93). New York: Routledge.
49. Musterd, S., & Andersson, R. (2005). Housing Mix, Social Mix, and Social Opportunities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(6), 761-790.

50. Ontario Human Rights Commission. (2011). *Comment of the Ontario Human Rights Commission on the Provincial Policy Statement 2005*. Ontario Human Rights Commission.
51. People Plan Toronto. (2008). *Making our Voices Heard in Planning our Neighbourhoods. Putting the Citizen's Back in Planning*. Toronto: People Plan Toronto.
52. People Plan Toronto. (2010, September 27). *Toronto Residents Call for the Creation of Neighbourhood Action*. Retrieved March 2, 2011, from People Plan Toronto website: <http://peopleplantoronto.org/media-releases/20100927>
53. Planning Act. (1993). c. P.13.
54. Polese, M., & Stren, R. (2000). *The Social Sustainability of Cities: Diversity and the Management of Change*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
55. Roberts, P. (2003). Sustainable Development and Social Justice: Spatial Priorities and Mechanisms for Delivery. *Sociological Inquiry*, 73(2), 228-244.
56. Robinson, P. (2009). Urban sustainability in Canada: The global-local connection. In C. D. Gore, & P. J. Stoett (Eds.), *Environmental challenges and opportunities: Local-global perspectives on Canadian issues* (pp. 159-181). Toronto: Emond Montgomery.
57. Saha, D., & Patterson, R. (2008). Local government efforts to promote the "three e's" of sustainable development: survey in medium to large cities in the United States. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 28, 21-37.
58. Sancton, A. (2000). The Municipal Role in Governance. In T. Bunting, & P. Fillion, *Canadian Cities in Transition: The twenty-first century* (2nd ed., pp. 425-442). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
59. Sandercock, L. (1998). *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
60. Smets, P., & Uyl, M. d. (2008). The Complex Role of Ethnicity in Urban Mixing: A Study of Two Deprived Neighbourhoods in Amsterdam. *Urban Studies*, 45(7), 1439-1460.
61. Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. (1979). *Metro's Suburbs in Transition*. Toronto: Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.
62. Springer, J. (1989). Living in St. Lawrence. In D. L. Gordon (Ed.), *Directions for New Urban Neighbourhoods: Learning from St. Lawrence* (pp. 6.2 - 6.15). Toronto: Ryerson Polytechnical Institute.
63. Taylor, Z., & Burchfield, M. (2010). *Growing cities: comparing urban growth and regional growth policies in Calgary, Toronto, and Vancouver*. Toronto: Neptis Foundation.
64. The City of New York. (2010). *Handbook for Community Board Members*. New York: The City of New York.

65. Toronto Community Foundation. (2005). *Toronto's Vital Signs 2005*. Toronto: Toronto Community Foundation.
66. Toronto Community Foundation. (2005). *Vital Signs Toronto*. Toronto: Toronto Community Foundation.
67. UNCED. (1992). Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, UN Doc. A/CONF.151/26 (vol. I); 31 ILM 874. *United Nations Conference on Environment and Development*. Rio de Janeiro.
68. United Way Toronto. (2011). *Poverty by Postal Code 2: Vertical Poverty, Declining Income, Housing Quality and Community Life in Toronto's Inner Suburban High-Rise Apartments*. Toronto: United Way.
69. WCED. (1987). *Our Common Future*. United Nations.
70. Wellesley Institute. (2010). *Submission by Wellesley Institute to PPS five-year review*. Toronto: Wellesley Institute.
71. Woolfe, J. M. (2004, July). Our Common Past: An Interpretation of Canadian Planning History. *Plan Canada*.
72. Yiftachel, O., & Hedgcock, D. (1993). Urban social sustainability: the planning of an Australian city. *Cities*, 140-157.