

FCSS

Community development



1. The issue

In recent years, the neighbourhood has gained increasing attention as a venue and vehicle for social change. Interest in neighbourhood, or place-based, development has escalated in concert with the body of research identifying the ways in which neighbourhoods can influence both individual well-being across the lifespan and the social and economic conditions of cities, for better or for worse.

Research on neighbourhood effects has grown exponentially in the past few years, with more than 25,000 new research studies and other academic articles published since 2009. These and previous studies show that individuals and families are affected by the neighbourhoods in which they live. Some people are affected more than others, depending on a broad range of factors. Neighbourhood “effects,” defined as the “net change in life chances associated with living in one neighbourhood rather than another,” can be either positive or negative, although much more is known about negative than positive neighbourhood effects. There is considerable evidence that living in a neighbourhood with a high concentration of poverty can diminish the life chances of both children and adults. Neighbourhood is not as important as individual attributes, family features, socio-economic status, or macro-economic conditions, but it is widely recognized that neighbourhoods with certain characteristics, most notably, a high proportion of people living in poverty, can exacerbate and even cause broader social problems.

Over the past few decades, neighbourhood decline in many American, European and, to a lesser extent, Canadian cities has

prompted forward-thinking societies to revisit and further explore the nature of the relationships between people and place. In some cities, these issues have assumed an urgent dimension. Blighted neighbourhoods, often characterized by high rates of poverty, crime and victimization, housing problems and crumbling infrastructure, can have broad, negative consequences for individuals, municipalities, and society as a whole. The goal of improving the well-being of residents via place-based interventions underpins massive neighbourhood renewal campaigns in the United Kingdom, along with more targeted initiatives in the United States, several countries in Europe, and Canada. This goal also underpins multiple strategies to “deconcentrate” poverty in the U.S., the U.K. and several western European countries.

While most Canadian cities have yet to experience the depth of urban decay encountered in other countries, even relatively well-off municipalities such as Calgary include low-income neighbourhoods. Many of these are at risk of further decline. More recent information is not yet available, but 2005 data from the previous federal census revealed that, in 24 Calgary neighbourhoods, over one-quarter of households were living below Statistics Canada’s Low-Income Cut-Off (LICO).^{*3} Household poverty rates exceeded 40 per cent in six neighbourhoods and over 50 per cent in three of these six neighbourhoods.⁴

During the past two decades Calgary and other major Canadian cities have seen a trend toward increasing economic spatial segregation and isolation.⁵ This means there are larger congregations and concentrations

NOVEMBER 2020

Introduction to FCSS research brief

This research brief is one of a series provided for FCSS-funded organizations and others in the field of preventive social services focused on enhancing social inclusion. It provides research-based information/statistics and guidance on programming, but is not intended to serve as a comprehensive program development toolkit.

Each section begins with the context from the 2014 version of the brief and is followed by a 2020 update. The title changed from “Strong Neighbourhoods,” as it was named in 2014, to “Community Development” to better align with the [FCSS Funding Framework](#).

The brief is organized as follows:

1. The issue
2. Neighbourhood effects – What are they and how do they work?
3. Strengthening neighbourhoods

Instead of summarizing research, the 2020 updates provide more recent statistics and curated lists of resources/links readers can access for more detailed information on each topic.

Clarifying concepts: “Neighbourhood” and “Community” There is considerable debate about defining the terms “neighbourhood” and “community”^{1,2}. In this brief we use these terms interchangeably. One approach describes a community as a group of people that have something in common. Used in this way, a community can include people who live near one another, as well as communities of attribution or interest. For this brief, though, both neighbourhoods and communities are geographic units. The resources included here will be less useful to programs not using a similar definition.

In partnership with



Acknowledgement: The content in the original text sections was written for FCSS by Merrill Cooper, Guyn Cooper Research Associates Ltd. and was first published in 2014.

Suggested citation: Calgary Neighbourhoods. 2020. Community Development. (Calgary, AB: Family & Community Support Services, The City of Calgary).

*A person in low income is someone whose income falls below Statistics Canada’s Low Income Cut-Offs (LICO) and this threshold is adjusted for every federal census. LICOs reflect an income level at which an individual or a family is likely to spend significantly more of its income on food, clothing and shelter than the average family. While no formal measure of poverty exists, LICO is commonly used as an acceptable measure of poverty for individuals and households, although it is not defined as such by Statistics Canada.

of low-income people in certain neighbourhoods, leading to greater disparity between neighbourhoods and, some contend, shrinking social capital in low-income areas⁶ (see also ^{7,8}). This is additional cause for concern. In fact, between 1980 and 2005, Calgary experienced more growth (81 per cent) in neighbourhood economic segregation than any other city in Canada.⁹ It is believed that this was driven by the increasing tendency of “like to live nearby like” in conjunction with increasing family inequality. Increasing family inequality was largely driven by the poorer quality of jobs that residents held in lower income neighbourhoods,⁹ rather than by unemployment or changes in government transfers or pension income. This trend has continued since 2005.

There is no single definition of a “strong” or “good” neighbourhood. It is generally agreed, however, that strong neighbourhoods feature (i) high levels of social cohesion and inclusion; (ii) good quality built and natural environments, including housing access, affordability and quality; (iii) accessible, affordable, and high quality amenities, programs, and services; and (iv) positive community economic development (see for example ¹⁰⁻¹²).

2020 update

City of Calgary Community Profiles, available at calgary.ca/communities, provide demographic, economic and housing information for each community and comparison data for Calgary as a whole.

The largest and most comprehensive study of neighbourhood change in Canadian history published an in-depth report on change in Calgary neighbourhoods in 2018: *Social-Spatial Polarization in an Age of Income Inequality: An Exploration of Neighbourhood Change in Calgary's “Three Cities.”* The study uses census tracts as neighbourhoods. Below are highlights about Calgary from this study:

- Calgary neighbourhoods have become increasingly socio-economically divided. In the 1970s and 1980s, 70 per cent of all census tracts were middle-income; this declined to 41 per cent in 2005.¹⁷

Likewise, there is no agreed-upon definition of a “poor” or “poor quality” neighbourhood. In the literature, indicators of poor neighbourhood quality include rates of concentrated poverty, unemployment, residential mobility, and crime, along with density of single-parent households.¹³ It is clear that Calgary’s lowest-income neighbourhoods lack many of the attributes of strong neighbourhoods. They feature characteristics that contribute to social exclusion, undermining the health and well-being of both child and adult residents. The larger and longer-running a neighbourhood’s problems, the stronger their cumulative impact on the people who live there.³

In Canada, neighbourhoods in which household poverty levels fall between 26 per cent and 39 per cent are often defined as “high poverty” areas.¹⁴ These neighbourhoods are considered to be at a threshold or “tipping point,” where neighbourhoods that are at risk of decline begin to tip downward. At this threshold social and economic problems accumulate and intensify, and residents either begin to move away or be negatively affected by the place in which they live. On the other hand, tipping point neighbourhoods that are in the process of revitalization

begin to tip upward. Problems diminish, property values increase, and so on. The tipping point for Canadian (and European) neighbourhoods is much higher than it is for American neighbourhoods. Some American research indicates that, once the proportion of low-income residents in an American neighbourhood reaches 15 per cent, the neighbourhood begins to discourage positive behaviours (such as working). When the poverty level reaches 20 per cent, the neighbourhood actually begins to encourage negative behaviours and problems (such as school drop-out, crime, and increased duration of household poverty).¹⁵ These differences among countries may be attributable to more extensive social, health, and other support programs in European countries and in Canada, compared with the United States. These programs are believed to mute negative neighbourhood effects (see for example ¹⁵).

Once a “very high poverty level,” defined as 40 per cent or higher in Canada,¹⁴ (see also ¹⁶) has been reached, neighbourhood renewal becomes very difficult. Therefore, tipping point neighbourhoods are considered ideal for revitalization efforts to prevent further decline and the myriad problems associated with spatially concentrated poverty.

- The share of all census tracts that are low-income/very low-income increased from 11 per cent in 1970 to 33 per cent in 2010, while the share of all census tracts that are high/very high income did not change, accounting for about 20 per cent in both time periods.¹⁷
- Many areas that were low-income inner-city communities in 1970 experienced gentrification creating a large region with above-average income in those areas.¹⁷
- The study illustrates that Calgary’s situation is likely getting worse. In 2010, only 29.6 per cent of Calgary census tracts were classified as income-increasing, 20.9 per cent were income-stable, and 49.6 per cent were income-decreasing, including some formerly high-income areas.¹⁷
- Income-decreasing areas had a lower share of people with a university education and a much higher share of people without a high school education. These areas had a significantly higher proportion of children (aged 0–14 years) and people aged 50–64.¹⁷
- Income polarization is the difference between the median income across different census tracts and is another measure of inequality. A separate study showed that between 2000 and 2015, Calgary showed a larger increase in income polarization than other Canadian cities. Below is the per cent increase in income polarization for the four cities included in the study:
 - 30 per cent – Calgary
 - 12 per cent – Vancouver
 - 11 per cent – Toronto
 - 1 per cent – Montreal¹⁸

2. Neighbourhood effects: What are they and how do they work?

Theories about and models of how living in a particular neighbourhood affects residents' outcomes, along with potential mediators and moderators of those effects, have abounded over the past several decades. In fact, there are now over 300,000 published articles on the subject. George Galster, perhaps the foremost researcher on neighbourhood effects, draws on his own and others' research to identify 15 potential causal pathways within four domains: social, environmental, geographical, and institutional.¹⁹ Sorting through the best evidence on neighbourhood effect mechanisms, Galster summarizes what we now know about neighbourhood effects and how they work as follows:¹⁹

- Spatially-concentrated poverty has been consistently linked with a range of negative outcomes. In some cases, the link between poverty and negative outcomes is weak social cohesion and lack of social control, but this is not always the case. This indicates that social cohesion is not the only mechanism at work.
- Spatially-concentrated poverty is not, on its own, definitively linked to labour market and employment outcomes. While a person living in a low-income neighbourhood may have worse life chances than an identical person in a better-off neighbourhood, this is not just because the neighbourhood's residents are poor. Rather, other factors causing or caused by concentrations of poverty are also at play.
- Exposure to violence in neighbourhoods has negative psychological impacts

on children and adults. Although the longitudinal evidence is still sparse, these impacts most likely endure and have long-term impacts on health, education, and economic outcomes. The same is true of exposure to environmental pollutants and toxins in housing and in neighbourhoods as a whole.

- Neighbourhood effects on children and youth can be substantial. With the probable exception of environmental toxins, they are largely mediated through parents, who are themselves influenced by the social, environmental, geographic, and institutional dimensions of neighbourhood.
- It is probably true that neighbourhood stigma, lack of local amenities and services, and negative local market actors (liquor stores, drug trade) cause negative neighbourhood effects. It has been very difficult to identify the precise causal pathways through research, however.
- In the U.S., there is evidence that neighbourhood problems are transmitted among residents through social contagion and/or collective socialization. In Western European countries, however, the findings are highly inconsistent and not compelling.
- The negative influence of disadvantaged neighbours is stronger than the positive influence of affluent neighbours, especially in the U.S. In addition, in the U.S., there is evidence that a certain threshold of affluent neighbours (with the threshold depending on the outcome being considered) influences social controls and collective socialization to the benefit

of less well-off neighbours. The findings from research on Western European neighbourhoods is much less definitive.

- Mixing of income groups in neighbourhoods has been introduced as a strategy to address competition and relative deprivation. It does not appear to be highly effective in countering negative neighbourhood effects, at least in Europe. (Note: As discussed in Section 3.2.3, recent evidence suggests some positive effects, under the right conditions, in several countries.)
- At least in the U.S., geographic barriers to accessing work (e.g., lack of public transit) and lack of access to good quality public services (e.g., education) have negative impacts on educational and employment outcomes.

Clearly, any one causal pathway is unlikely to exist on its own. Instead, multiple forces interact and have, at minimum, additive and, probably, exponential effects. However, research has yet to sort out how the pathways work together or the threshold for particular problems (such as neighbourhood crime or social disorder) that is required to tip a neighbourhood up or down. From a public policy perspective, Galster is not the first to note that neighbourhood is not a "black box" where discrete, stand-alone interventions can be introduced to achieve a particular outcome.¹⁶ Rather, strengthening neighbourhoods to improve residents' outcomes and ensure that they contribute to, rather than detract from, a city as a whole requires intervention on multiple fronts.

2.1 Evidence of neighbourhood effects in Canada

Canada has a much smaller body of research on neighbourhood effects than the U.S., the U.K., Western Europe and Australia have. Nonetheless, substantiated research on neighbourhood effects in this country includes the following.

2.1.1 Child and adult health

There is considerable evidence that neighbourhood income levels influence residents' health. The most-accepted explanation is that

"individual poverty is compounded by the attributes of the poor neighbourhood, which might include both material and social characteristics: underinvestment in

*neighbourhood services and public goods; exposure to noise and pollutants, crime, conflict or disarray; socialization effects on behaviour and transmission of health-compromising social norms; social isolation and isolation from economic opportunity."*²⁰

Variations in adult health based on neighbourhood residence have been

documented on a wide range of outcomes, including physical health, overall mortality, health-related behaviour, and mental health (see for example ^{21,22}). For example, research reveals a high concentration of health and social problems among Montreal residents living in the city's lowest-income areas. These residents have significantly lower life

expectancies, higher rates of adolescent pregnancy, asthma, and other serious health issues, and higher rates of avoidable hospitalization and mortality than residents in other Montreal neighbourhoods than those in many other Canadian cities.^{10,23} Other Montreal research has documented an association between depression and within-neighbourhood social capital, as measured by generalized trust, trust in neighbours, and perceptions of neighbourhood cohesion.²⁴ Perhaps the most compelling Canadian research investigating neighbourhood effects on health is a recently-published, 22-year longitudinal study which reported higher mortality rates among Canadians living in “materially deprived” neighbourhoods, as measured by income, employment, and education, and among Canadians living in “socially deprived neighbourhoods,” as measured by lone-parent families, adults living alone, and adults who were separated, divorced, or widowed. Material and social deprivation often coincide at the neighbourhood level. Both were found to result in a shorter life span for low-income individuals who lived in lower-income neighbourhoods, as compared with low-income individuals living in higher-income neighbourhoods.²⁰

Most Canadian research suggests that neighbourhood income, along with neighbourhood ethno-racial diversity and the proportion of residents over the age of 65 years, has a modest impact on seniors’ health, but seniors’ health is more affected by individual characteristics, including involvement in physical activity, alcohol consumption, sense of community belonging, household income, and education (see for example ^{25,26}). On the other hand, for seniors and for persons

with physical and mental disabilities, neighbourhood structure (e.g., walkability, “wheelability”), amenities (e.g., gathering places, public transit), and accessibility to services (e.g., grocery stores, banks, health care) are associated with social participation, which is associated with health-related behaviour and to physical and mental health (see for example ²⁷⁻²⁹).

The following are examples of Canadian studies that demonstrate how children’s physical health can be compromised by neighbourhood conditions:

- Research using data from Canada’s National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY)* revealed that small children were at greater risk of physical injury in low socio-economic status neighbourhoods. This was partly due to higher levels of family dysfunction, but also to parental perceptions about neighbourhood cohesion and neighbourhood problems. Notably, the researchers concluded that strategies to increase families’ socio-economic status, without improving parenting skills, would not lead to significant reductions in childhood injuries.³⁰
- Research from Saskatoon reported that, among kindergarten students living in low-income neighbourhoods, physical health and well-being (as measured by the Early Development Index) declined from one group of students to the next over a five-year period.³¹
- A Saskatoon study found that neighbourhood socio-economic status (SES), neighbourhood physical condition (condition of infrastructure, proportion of houses in need of repair, street width, road conditions, appearance, noise level,

stoplights and crosswalks), and large household size were independently and collectively linked to child hospitalization rates, even when researchers controlled for individual risk factors. Interestingly, social disconnection (voting, household moves, ethnic diversity, and crime), availability and accessibility of programs and services, and smoking prevalence were not linked with hospitalization rates, possibly because neighbourhood SES and physical condition captured the underlying mechanisms of neighbourhood effects better than the other factors individually.³²

Canadian research also documents many ways in which neighbourhood influences children’s and adolescents’ health behaviours. For example:

- Research using data from the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children Survey reported that perceptions of neighbourhood safety were highly correlated with levels of physical activity among Canadian students in grades 6 to 10. Interestingly, no association was found between physical activity and the number of parks and recreational facilities within five kilometres of schools, irrespective of perceptions about neighbourhood safety.³³
- Canadian Community Health Survey data show that youth aged 12 to 18 years, especially Caucasian girls, living in low-income neighbourhoods are more likely to smoke than boys and non-Caucasian girls. (The term “Caucasian” is used because it appeared in the original report.) Living in a low-income neighbourhood and experiencing a strong sense of belonging to that neighbourhood put youth of both genders at increased risk of smoking.³⁴

2.1.2 Child development

For children, neighbourhood is less important than family and individual factors,³⁵ but neighbourhood conditions can interact with family and individual functioning to the detriment of children’s development. It is widely believed that neighbourhood effects on children’s

development are largely mediated by parenting. As summarized by Roosa and colleagues,

“[I]ike most risk factors, neighbourhood factors rarely, if ever, have direct effects on children. Instead, neighbourhood factors are expected to influence children primarily

by triggering one or more events or processes or a chain reaction of processes that are more proximal to the child; it is these more proximal influences that influence child development.”¹³

There are many theories about how neighbourhood and parenting factors

*The NLSCY, now discontinued, followed, a large, representative sample of Canadian children from birth to 25 years of age, with a view to measuring the well-being and development of Canada’s children and youth into adulthood. Data collection commenced in 1994 and continues at two-year intervals. Researchers have analyzed data to produce a range of papers on the biological, social, and economic characteristics influencing child outcomes. NLSCY data and research have greatly enhanced our knowledge about the conditions in which Canadian children live and the ways in which we can improve children’s well-being. See Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC). 2000. *National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth*. (Ottawa, ON: HRDC).

interact to shape children's developmental outcomes. Research substantiates various theories to varying degrees. Canadian research from the NLSCY indicates that neighborhood disadvantage manifests its effect via lower neighborhood cohesion. Lower neighbourhood cohesion is associated with maternal depression and family dysfunction, which in turn is associated with poor parenting practices that lead to negative child outcomes.³⁶ These findings are consistent with a large body of research from around the world (see for example³⁷⁻³⁹). They suggest that, at least for young children, addressing neighbourhood income and/or cohesion without also strengthening parenting practices may not be sufficient to improve developmental outcomes. However, "failure to acknowledge [neighbourhood] influences may mean overlooking key factors that differentiate successful and unsuccessful low-income urban children"¹³ (see also⁴⁰⁻⁴³).

A full discussion of the research in Canada documenting links between neighbourhood quality and child and youth development (see for example^{13,35,40,44,45}) is beyond the scope of this document, but a few examples are provided here.

- Canadian research using data from the NLSCY has found that school readiness is influenced by neighbourhood affluence,

employment rates, and safety and cohesion, along with family characteristics, including income level and parental education. In one large study, neighbourhood effects on preschool children were found to be significant, even after controlling for family SES. For toddlers, neighbourhood effects were mediated more strongly by family characteristics, suggesting an association between neighbourhood effects and child age.³⁵

- Other research using NLSCY data found that the strongest predictors of conduct, emotional, or hyperactivity problems among young children were a one-parent family structure and family SES. However, neighbourhood independently accounted for a small and significant part of differences.³⁶
- Willms' large study using data from both the NLSCY and the Understanding the Early Years (UEY)* surveys concluded that "[t]he four most important family and community factors related to children's early vocabulary skills, aside from SES and number of children, were the amount that parents read to their children, the extent to which the family functioned as a cohesive unit, the degree of social support in the neighbourhood, and the stability of the neighbourhood."³⁷

- Research by Hertzman and colleagues⁴⁷ on Vancouver neighbourhoods and children's development revealed strong associations between children's development and the socio-economic status and other features of the neighbourhoods in which they lived. Low neighbourhood income was clearly paralleled by developmental vulnerabilities among children. Consistent with previous research showing that children in low SES families can benefit from the presence of more affluent neighbours, (see for example⁴⁴). Hertzman found that Vancouver children from families with socio-demographic risks (e.g., low-income, single-parent, low education, etc.) who lived in mixed-income or more affluent neighborhoods did not appear to be at as high a developmental risk as their counterparts in low SES neighbourhoods. Another study completed by Hertzman revealed the ongoing impact of living in a low-income neighbourhood in early childhood. When he followed children living in low-income neighbourhoods in B.C. from kindergarten to grade seven, Hertzman found that neighbourhood disadvantage that children experienced at ages five and six negatively influenced their language and cognitive development seven years later, even when researchers controlled for current neighbourhood conditions.⁴⁸

2.1.3 Adult income and employment

There appears to be only one Canadian study investigating a relationship between neighbourhood and employment. Retrospectively analyzing the economic outcomes of adults who grew up in Toronto, In 2003 Oreopoulos concluded that "youths in low-income families gain no advantages from living in middle-income neighbourhoods in the suburbs and no disadvantages from living in the poorest neighbourhoods in downtown Toronto."⁴⁹

Oreopoulos did not explore any other neighbourhood factors, and studies from elsewhere in the world indicate that neighbourhood income alone may not explain employment outcomes. Rather, it is the factors associated with spatially concentrated poverty that can directly or indirectly contribute to education, labour force participation, and income levels. Examples of such factors are: neighbourhood stigma,⁵⁰ distance from

suitable employment,^{51,52} and a wide range of other factors, including crime and social disorder, neighbourhood norms and cohesion, social capital, built and natural environment, and amenities and services. The international research shows that, the larger and longer-running the neighbourhood's problems, the stronger their cumulative impact on economic well-being.³

* *Understanding the Early Years (UEY)* is a federal government initiative that provides communities with information on the "readiness to learn" of their children, the family and community factors that influence child development, and the local resources available to support young children and their families. This neighbourhood-specific information is used by communities to design and implement focused policies, programs and investments that enable their young children to thrive in the early years. UEY is currently underway in 12 pilot communities across Canada, and will be expanded to 100 communities by 2011.

2.2 Factors that cause or perpetuate neighbourhood low income in Canada

2.2.1 Neighbourhood stigma and isolation

The issue of neighbourhood stigma may be less of a problem in Canadian cities, particularly Calgary, compared to cities in other countries. However, neighbourhood isolation, in terms of the distance between residential locations and jobs for unskilled workers, can be a problem. In Calgary, suitable jobs for unskilled workers are often located in the periphery of the city. Some of these jobs are not accessible by public

transit. Even when public transit connects neighbourhoods and jobs, the travel time required may make it impossible to arrive at work on time.

Canadian research shows that, nationally, residents in poor quality neighbourhoods express growing dissatisfaction in their personal life over time. They consistently identify employment, improved finances,

housing, and enhancement of services (e.g. policing, health and social services, recreation) as factors that need to be addressed to improve their quality of life.⁵³ Problems in each of these areas undermine social cohesion, preventing residents from fully participating in social, cultural, civic and economic aspects of their communities, and improving neighbourhoods from within (see for example ^{23, 54-57}).

2.2.2 Poor quality of and lack of access to amenities, resources and services

The links between poor resources and poverty and other negative adult outcomes are usually explained in terms of an instrumental model, where the absence of institutional resources in poor neighbourhoods limits individual agency.⁵⁶ Poor quality neighbourhood resources and lack of access to existing neighbourhood resources foster social exclusion of residents. (Neighbourhood resources include: public transportation; neighbourhood maintenance; retail services; schools; health

care; recreational opportunities, including those in natural settings; child care and other key social services; informal organizations; and employment.^{3,58}) For example, as neighbourhoods decline, so does positive economic development. Important retail services such as banks are gradually replaced by payday loan companies and, sometimes, bars, liquor outlets, and “adult entertainment” stores, along with other less desirable services. This contributes to lower levels of neighbourhood affiliation.

Middle-income residents begin to leave the neighbourhood. This leads to lower property values, higher concentrations of poverty, and further neighbourhood decline, at which point crime and social disorder (e.g., the sex trade, drug trafficking) can set in. When a neighbourhood declines to this point, intensive and expensive, even Herculean, initiatives can be required to turn things around.

2.2.3 Poor quality built and natural environments

A neighbourhood’s natural environment includes the quality of the soil, air, and water. Vehicular traffic in and around the neighbourhood, the age of the neighbourhood, previous uses of the land, and the proportion of green space and volume of trees can influence each of these components of the natural environment.

Housing is a feature of a neighbourhood’s built environment. In addition to the health and other consequences of poor quality housing, research indicates that the type of housing, length of residence in that housing, and residents’ perceptions about their housing influence perceptions about neighbourhoods and the way residents interact with their neighbours. Higher-density housing, with smaller houses on smaller lots mixed closely with low-rise apartments and multi-level buildings and well-landscaped lots, provides both privacy and sense of community.

Short building setbacks and front porches and balconies near the street encourage community interaction.⁵⁹ For example, residents, visitors, and international studies agree that Vancouver’s densification plan, guided by “complete neighbourhood” and “pedestrian first” policies, has improved the quality of life in affected neighbourhoods.⁶⁰ However, housing density that is too high can be detrimental. Controlling for socio-economic status, residents of multi-family dwellings, compared with residents of single-family homes, report greater marital and parent-child conflict. High-rise housing has also been associated with less socially supportive relationships with neighbours.⁶¹ In addition, very high-density housing developments are sometimes associated with crime.⁶²

Research suggests that, in addition to housing, certain features of neighbourhood design encourage social cohesion and social

sustainability and directly benefit residents of all ages. These include:

- Street characteristics that discourage heavy vehicular traffic, such as discontinuous street patterns and narrow roads. These features encourage informal contact among neighbours “that develop into social networks [and] are at the root of feelings of belonging and security, which are prime factors in resident satisfaction.”⁶² In addition, households on streets with higher traffic volume interact less with their neighbours relative to those residing on less congested streets.⁶¹
- Pedestrian-oriented design and “wheel-oriented” design, for bicycles, wheelchairs, and strollers, with pathways connecting all neighbourhood uses and with the majority of parking behind buildings, to improve safety, noise levels, and encourage social contact among residents and healthy activity levels.⁶³

- Green space has social and psychological benefits. It “provides visual relief and opportunity for relaxation, becomes a place for casual contacts, and forms a haven for kids’ play.”⁶⁴ In addition, research shows that proximity to green space and trees in neighbourhoods buffers both adults and children from stress and adversity (see for example ⁶⁵⁻⁶⁸). However, if poorly designed and supervised, green space can become a locale for crime and drug use.⁶⁴
- Public art, featured prominently, and arts and cultural activities help bring people together, draw newcomers into the community, and provide opportunities for learning and communication (see for example ⁶⁹).
- The application of environmental design principles that help to prevent crime, which are often called CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) principles.
- Physically- and visually-accessible public spaces, located along major pedestrian

thoroughfares, to serve as focal and gathering places for community events and activities.⁶³

The United Kingdom has shown particular interest in the social value of public spaces. Research there has helped to clarify the ways in which good public spaces can contribute to social inclusion, social capital development, and sense of community and neighbourhood attachment (see for example ⁷⁰). The idea of public space is not limited to traditional outdoor spaces, such as parks. It includes:

“gatherings at the school gate, activities in community facilities, shopping malls, cafés and car boot [garage] sales... where people meet and create places of exchange. To members of the public, it is not the ownership of places or their appearance that makes them ‘public,’ but their shared use for a diverse range of activities by a range of different people.”⁷¹ For example, British research has found that street markets which, admittedly, are not common in Canadian neighbourhoods, are crucial

social hubs in the daily lives of seniors, “more important than for any other group.”⁷²

As summarized by Worpole and Knox, research indicates that “successful” social spaces in England:⁷¹

- “are physically accessible and welcoming, and have extended opening hours;
- foster or feature the exchange of goods and services (beyond simple consumerism);
- are managed well but discreetly, leaving room for residents to organize their own activities;
- are shared by diverse age, social, and ethnocultural groups, for a range of activities;
- avoid over-regulation of design and space, as security and well-being are more likely to grow out of active use; and
- encourage a strong sense of “local distinctiveness.”

2.2.4 Low levels of personal capital, social capital and social cohesion

In life, personal (or human) capital (education, skills, and other personal attributes) and social capital (connections and support) enable personal and economic success and social mobility. Low-income neighbourhoods typically include high proportions of residents with no or low market income, a high share of income from transfer payments made by governments, low educational attainment, and low school enrolment among adolescents and young adults. The effects of these variables are more profound when they exist in combination. In addition, many of these neighbourhoods feature high concentrations of population groups who face many social and economic barriers and are at high risk of living in poverty. These include recent immigrants, Aboriginal peoples, unattached adults and lone-parent families.⁷ (The term ‘aboriginal’ is used because that was the language in the cited reference.)

Poor neighbourhoods often lack positive role models due to the absence of a successful middle class.⁵⁸ They may feature social ties and subcultures that stress short-term goals over, for example, education.⁵⁰ Also, because of higher unemployment

levels, lone parenthood and, sometimes, a high number of seniors, residents of low-income neighbourhoods tend to spend more time in their local areas than do residents of wealthier neighbourhoods “[and] ...contacts tend to be between people with networks which do not extend into the world of work.”⁷³

On the one hand, both families and individuals may be very isolated, with little connection at all to the neighbourhood in which they live. On the other hand, even if they have high levels of within-community or bonding social capital, depending on role models and peer associations, this may constrain, rather than enable, routes out of poverty.⁷⁴

As Bradford observed,

“the poor ... not only live in poverty but among other people who are also poor and separated from those who are not, signalling the absence of social networks linking to opportunity, or even information about where potential opportunities might exist. This leads to place-specific ‘neighbourhood effects,’ whereby social exclusion, perhaps originating in individual human capital deficiencies or unemployment, is compounded by features of the locality itself.”⁷⁵

It is generally agreed that social capital is both a cause and a consequence of social cohesion, that social cohesion (see for example ⁷⁶) is one requirement or component of social inclusion, and that social exclusion undermines social cohesion. Not surprisingly then, low-income neighbourhoods often have low levels of social cohesion. The term “social cohesion” is used by researchers and policy analysts to mean a range of different but inter-related concepts, including common values and a civic culture, social order and social control, social solidarity and reduction in wealth disparities, social networks and social capital, and place attachment and identity.⁷⁷

Differences in approach have led to many definitions of social cohesion, exploration of which is beyond the scope of this research brief. For purposes of this discussion, the Government of Canada’s Social Cohesion Network’s simple approach serves nicely. The Network describes social cohesion as “the sum of individuals’ willingness to cooperate with each other without coercion in the range of collective activities and institutions necessary for a society to survive and prosper, as well as in the complex set

Community development

of social relations needed by individuals to complete their life courses.^{77B}

Four key elements were identified by the Government of Canada's Social Cohesion Network as necessary and interactive parts of social cohesion:

- Widespread participation in community and social life.
- Social capital.
- Institutions (e.g., the Charter of Rights) and infrastructure (e.g., transportation) that facilitate public involvement.
- Income distribution, equity, inclusion, and access.⁷⁸

At the neighbourhood level, social cohesion generally refers to a sense of social unity and cooperation among neighbours, and the desire and willingness to work together for the collective good of community members. Like social cohesion in general, neighbourhood cohesion has been conceptualized in many ways, but most approaches include sense of community, neighbourhood affiliation or attachment (e.g., neighbourhood pride, residential mobility rates), and neighbouring (or neighbourliness). Measures of neighbourhood cohesion generally include such things as neighbouring practices (e.g., exchanging favours), within-neighbourhood

participation and volunteerism, and social networks or ties and social support (for a concise summary, see ⁷⁹, for a more detailed discussion, see for example ⁸⁰⁻⁸⁴).

Finally, the neighbourhood's services and resources as well as its built and natural environments and economic development also influence neighbourhood cohesion, as discussed above. As just one example, people who live on streets with higher traffic volume interact less with their neighbours relative to those residing on less congested streets.⁶¹

2020 update

Table 1 below, includes research studies and several types of research summaries describing neighbourhood effects and how they work. These summaries include literature reviews, which are narrative summaries of existing research on a specific topic, and systematic reviews, which use more rigorous methods to collect and assess studies and synthesize findings. They also include meta-analyses, which use a type of statistical analysis that combines the results of multiple similar scientific studies to determine whether the overall effect is positive or negative. The first section includes overviews and below that are resources focused on specific topics.

Table 1: Resources about neighbourhood effects and how they work

	Resources
Overviews of neighbourhood effects	<p>A Systematic Review of Interventions to Boost Social Relations Through Improvements in Community Infrastructure⁸⁵</p> <p>Targeted Neighbourhood Social Policy: a Critical Analysis⁸⁶</p> <p>Your Life Chances Affect Where You Live: A Critique of the "Cottage Industry" of Neighbourhood Effects Research⁸⁷</p> <p>Neighbourhood Revitalization in Canada: Towards Place-Based Policy Solutions⁸⁸</p> <p>Neighbourhood Effects or Neighbourhood Based Problems? A Policy Context⁸⁹</p>
Access to amenities and services	<p>Natural Amenities, Neighbourhood Dynamics, and Persistence in the Spatial Distribution of Income⁹⁰</p> <p>Location Efficiency and Affordability: A National Analysis of Walkable Access and HUD-Assisted Housing⁹¹</p> <p>Examining Food Purchasing Patterns from Sales Data at a Full-Service Grocery Store Intervention in a Former Food Desert⁹²</p>
Built and natural environments (included for informational purposes only, as built and natural environments are not within the FCSS mandate)	<p>The Impact of the Natural Environment on the Promotion of Active Living: An Integrative Systematic Review⁹³</p> <p>The Role of Urban Neighbourhood Green Space in Children's Emotional and Behavioral Resilience⁹⁴</p> <p>Can the Neighbourhood Built Environment Make a Difference in Children's Development? Building the Research Agenda to Create Evidence for Place-based Children's Policy⁹⁵</p> <p>A Review of the Effects of Physical Built Environment Attributes on Enhancing Walking and Cycling Activity Levels Within Residential Neighbourhoods⁹⁶</p>

	Resources
Child development	<p>A Review of Neighborhood Effects and Early Child Development: How, Where, and For Whom, Do Neighborhoods Matter?⁹⁷</p> <p>The Influence of the Neighborhood Physical Environment on Early Child Health and Development: A Review and Call for Research⁹⁸</p> <p>Neighbourhood Social Fragmentation and The Mental Health of Children in Poverty⁹⁹</p>
Income/wealth inequality	<p>Socio-Spatial Polarization In An Age of Income Inequality: An Exploration of Neighbourhood Change In Calgary's "Three Cities"¹⁷</p> <p>Homeownership, Asset-Based Welfare and The Neighbourhood Segregation of Wealth¹⁰⁰</p> <p>Keep Up With The Joneses or Keep on as Their Neighbours: Life Satisfaction and Income in Canadian Urban Neighbourhoods¹⁰¹</p>
Mental health	<p>The Longitudinal Effects of Neighbourhood Social and Material Deprivation Change on Psychological Distress in Urban, Community Dwelling Canadian Adults¹⁰²</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Effects on Health and Well-being (NEHW) Study¹⁰³</p> <p>Neighbourhood Characteristics and 10-Year Risk of Depression in Canadian Adults With and Without A Chronic Illness¹⁰⁴</p>
Neighbourhood stigma and isolation	<p>"I Fit the Description": Experiences of Social and Spatial Exclusion Among Ghanaian Immigrant Youth in the Jane and Finch Neighbourhood of Toronto¹⁰⁵</p> <p>Creating "Spaces For Diversity" from "Spaces of Modernity": The Case of the Jane-Finch Neighbourhood, Toronto (Canada)¹⁰⁶</p>
Social capital and cohesion	<p>How Neighbourhood Social Mix Shapes Access to Resources from Social Networks and from Services¹⁰⁷</p> <p>Effect of Neighbourhood Deprivation and Social Cohesion on Mental Health Inequality: A Multilevel Population-Based Longitudinal Study¹⁰⁸</p> <p>The Association Between Neighbourhoods and Educational Achievement, A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis¹⁰⁹</p> <p>The Conditionality of Neighbourhood Effects Upon Social Neighbourhood Embeddedness: A Critical Examination of the Resources and Socialization Mechanisms¹¹⁰</p>

3. Strengthening neighbourhoods

The strengthening neighbourhoods, or "place-based," approach seeks to provide a direct path to better outcomes for residents. The place-based approach considers neighbourhoods to be a vehicle for preventing social exclusion. This is accomplished by increasing social cohesion and social capital, addressing barriers to employment and social mobility, and helping to prevent negative developmental outcomes among children and youth by supporting children and families. This can be accomplished by improving one or more of the four dimensions of neighbourhood: social cohesion and inclusion; natural and built environments; resources and services; and positive economic development. In Canada and the U.S., large-scale neighbourhood strengthening initiatives are sometimes referred to as "comprehensive community initiatives," with "comprehensive" meaning that "people strive to combine

strategic action or project work with systems-wide change that will ensure deep and durable outcomes."¹¹¹

Efforts to revitalize neighbourhoods are rarely guided by a strictly-defined model. Rather, these efforts strive to involve residents in building social and human capital and fostering collaboration among residents, community organizations, and sources of support, expertise, and power beyond the neighbourhood. The purpose is to improve neighbourhood conditions and, ultimately, the quality of life and life course of those who live there.¹¹² What works in one place may not necessarily work in another.¹¹³

Strengthening neighbourhoods is not a "magic bullet" that will prevent or redress all social ills. The primary source of poverty generally lies outside poor neighbourhoods, and sustained governmental intervention is needed to ensure a basic quality of life

for Canadians via adequate health care, education, income, and social services which, concurrently, foster social and residential mobility and reduce and prevent spatially-concentrated poverty, and to ensure that low-income families and individuals can obtain supports and services wherever they live.

An assessment of Victoria, Australia's Neighbourhood Renewal Project drew similar conclusions:

*"[W]hile local community strengthening strategies can lead to real improvements in community networks, infrastructure and capacity, they are no substitute for the inclusive and redistributive taxation, income security, service delivery and labour market policies needed to create the conditions for sustainable reductions in poverty, inequality and social exclusion."*¹¹⁴

That being said, there is a compelling need for local action to influence national and provincial policy agendas, and ensure the coordination and supplementation of government programs in place-based initiatives. The place-based approach to building and sustaining strong neighbourhoods by creating lasting changes in community conditions is a vital component of a broader social inclusion strategy and a means of directly improving residents' lives. This approach may be particularly important in Calgary where, as noted earlier, economic spatial segregation, and its attendant problems, is on the rise.

Key learnings from neighbourhood strengthening initiatives¹⁵

Strengthening neighbourhoods takes a long time, though some “quick fixes” can have a significant short-term impact.

Depending on neighbourhood conditions and pre-existing capacity, efforts to strengthen social capital and social cohesion, and mobilize communities to address even simple issues can take between three and 10 years.

There is no single best approach to strengthening neighbourhoods.

Determining how to proceed requires assessment of the neighbourhood's social and demographic profile, current capacities, conditions and, most importantly, residents' needs and desires. Funders or other external players must not draw a specific blueprint for neighbourhood building.

It is vital that residents, rather than people from external organizations, drive and lead neighbourhood building.

The success of any initiative, regardless of its scope, depends on resident “ownership.” External organizations can support the work, but must refrain from driving the community. Other residents must perceive project leaders to be legitimate community representatives. Leaders should represent the diversity of the local community (for example, Indigenous people, members of non-dominant ethno-cultural groups, persons with disabilities, persons from all age groups). It is usually essential to invest in initiatives that focus on fostering and nurturing new leaders from within the neighbourhood.

Existing or ad hoc neighbourhood organizations, or multiple residents' organizations working in collaboration as a steering committee should spearhead and manage neighbourhood strengthening initiatives. However, such entities may require many supports to help them move forward. All initiatives should include a capacity-building component. It can't be assumed that existing community associations in low-income neighbourhoods have the capacity to take on issues or projects, or that they are viable mechanisms for promoting resident participation in neighbourhood affairs.

Place-based initiatives need to be combined with other relevant policies.

Neighbourhood strategies should watch for and connect with or leverage their initiatives with wider opportunities. Planning and development in the broader city context, such as municipal transit, density, and recreation plans shape neighbourhood renewal. Often neighbourhood renewal even depends on municipal planning and development.

3.1 A brief summary of outcomes and learnings from large, neighbourhood revitalization schemes

Canada

Vibrant Communities Canada and Action for Neighbourhood Change were Canada's largest multi-site initiatives. Both focused on poverty reduction. Neither initiative has been empirically evaluated in a comprehensive way.

Action for Neighbourhood Change (ANC) was a two-year action and research project from 2005 to 2007 to “explore and assess approaches to locally-driven neighbourhood revitalization that can enhance the capacity of individuals and families to build and sustain strong, healthy communities.”¹¹⁶ ANC targeted neighbourhoods in Surrey, Regina, Thunder Bay, Toronto, and Halifax. With funding from local United Ways, ANC project staff worked with neighbourhood residents with a view to revitalizing neighbourhoods. At the conclusion of two years, among its accomplishments ANC identified increased leadership capacity

and community engagement in the target neighbourhoods, an extensive collection of neighbourhood development resources, and leveraged resources.¹¹⁷ Action for Neighbourhood Change has continued beyond the research project, most notably in Toronto and Hamilton (discussed below).

Vibrant Communities (VC) was initiated in 2002 by Tamarack – An Institute for Community Engagement, the Caledon Institute of Social Policy, and the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation as a poverty reduction research initiative in 13 Canadian cities. Tamarack's eight-year evaluation of VC concluded that, overall, VC had contributed to increased community efficacy and capacity, had influenced public and private poverty-related policies, improved community responses to poverty challenges, contributed to initiatives that assist households out of poverty, influenced overall levels of poverty in neighbourhoods,

and contributed to the neighbourhood change and poverty reduction knowledge base.¹¹⁸ Vibrant Communities continues in 12 cities, including Calgary, where it has been a strong advocate on local policy issues. Vibrant Calgary has played a successful role in influencing The City to reduce the cost of the low-income transit pass and to implement a municipal poverty reduction strategy.

Gardner, et al. summarize the outcomes of comprehensive community initiatives in Canada as follows:¹¹⁹

- Overall, initiatives have been successful in moving poverty up the public policy agenda, building broad-based collaborative initiatives, and supporting community capacity building, although it is not known whether these outcomes will be sustained over time.

- Some initiatives have supported the development of comprehensive, effective, integrated services in low-income neighbourhoods, which ameliorate the impact of poverty on residents, and may improve child developmental outcomes.
- Some initiatives appear to have enhanced the individual strengths of some people living in poverty by increasing individual and household assets (e.g., skills, employability, savings) but these efforts have not affected large numbers of people.
- Many initiatives have influenced policy and funding changes at the local level. Initiatives have not succeeded in reducing overall numbers or proportions of people living in poverty in neighbourhoods or beyond.

Gardner, among others, concludes that, to reduce poverty at the population level, within or beyond neighbourhoods, community change initiatives in Canada must also address the wider roots of poverty and inequality.

Toronto's neighbourhood change initiative has been among the most successful in the country so far. Briefly, the United Way of Toronto's Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy continues the ANC and other work in 13 priority neighbourhoods through direct and leveraged investments, resident grants, youth initiatives, and improved access to community supports through the establishment of neighbourhood hubs (discussed further in Section 3.2.4).

The City of Toronto's neighbourhood revitalization efforts parallel United Way's Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy by funding Neighbourhood Action Teams in each priority neighbourhood and investing in neighbourhood built and social infrastructure¹²⁰ Important, tangible outcomes of the strategy thus far include a 19 per cent reduction in reported incidents of crime across all priority neighbourhoods, dramatic growth in programs and services, community groups, and resident-led neighbourhood improvement projects in the priority neighbourhoods.¹²¹

Hamilton's neighbourhood development strategy provides another example. This initiative shows promise in that it clearly draws on learning from initiatives in other Canadian cities that are at more

KINGSTON-GALLOWAY/ORTON PARK (KGO) IN SCARBOROUGH, TORONTO¹²⁵

KGO is a low-income community with a high immigrant population. It is now identified as a model for positive change. In 2005, United Way of Greater Toronto and the City of Toronto identified KGO as one of the Priority Neighbourhoods. A University of Toronto study attributed neighbourhood revitalization to pre-existing community capacity featuring high levels of resident engagement and leadership. Investments of services and staff support increased this capacity. Lessons learned from KGO include the following:

- Investing in social and physical infrastructure of under-resourced communities is critical.
- Greater funding for the City's Neighbourhood Action Partnership (NAP) would improve its effectiveness.
- Some community engagement models may exploit residents' time and energy. Clear lines of accountability and multiple forms of participation, including policy and program design and community and organizational governance, are required. The current model is over-reliant on volunteering, resulting in burnout and frustration among residents.
- Direct commitments to social justice and anti-oppression in community development are needed. This includes staff training and opportunities for residents to make their voices heard.
- Flexible and sustained funding is essential for building social infrastructure.
- It takes more than community development to reduce poverty. Policy changes are required to address broader issues such as precarious work, unaffordable housing, and limited access to transportation.

advanced stages of development. The City of Hamilton is targeting 11 low-income neighbourhoods. They are providing community development workers to support residents to develop neighbourhood improvement plans and facilitate their implementation with neighbourhood grants from the City and the Hamilton Community Foundation. Some neighbourhoods have developed plans, which are action-oriented and measurable.^{122,123}

United States

Hundreds of neighbourhood improvement strategies of varying scope and size have been undertaken in the U.S. over the past few decades, many of them stand-alone initiatives. An American policy think tank, the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change (the Aspen Institute) undertook a comprehensive review of 48 major community change efforts launched since 1990.¹²⁴ This review reported mixed results. No initiatives demonstrated widespread improvements in child and family well-being or neighbourhood poverty. The key findings of the review are as follows:

- Almost all initiatives increased community capacity in such forms as stronger leadership, networks or organizations, and/or improved connections between the

neighbourhood and external entities in the public, private, and non-profit sectors.

- Some initiatives resulted in physical improvements to neighbourhoods and related positive outcomes, such as increased property values and decreased crime. Physical neighbourhood revitalization can be an effective catalyst for neighbourhood change.
- Many initiatives improved the quantity and quality of neighbourhood-based programming for low-income families, resulting in improvements in the well-being of individual program participants, but not in population-level improvements.
- "Place-based efforts have had difficulty stimulating broader economic development, as too many of the forces that drive economic activity are outside of the control of neighborhood actors."¹²⁴
- Some initiatives have succeeded in increasing funding and leveraging new sources of funding for the neighbourhood and, by working in partnership with other communities, organizations, and individuals, in influencing policy change at the local level. However, they have not been able to influence policy or reform systems at a sufficiently high level to reduce poverty rates in neighbourhoods.¹²⁴

According to the Aspen Institute, the most successful American neighbourhood initiatives included five specific features:¹²⁴

- (i) A clear mission, desired outcomes, operating principles, and plan, including a time frame and specific tasks.
- (ii) Deliberate, intentional investments in all the relevant domains of change for that neighbourhood (i.e., initiatives that assumed that investments in one domain would have spillover effects in others were ineffective).
- (iii) A focus on significantly building the capacity of residents to set agendas, gain access to resources, and respond to community needs.
- (iv) A large investment of time and political, social, and economic capital in managing partnerships and collaborations, essentially “subsidiz[ing]’ the relationships, sectors, and interests until new habits of thinking, acting, and collaborating enable alignment to occur more naturally.”¹²⁴
- (v) Ongoing evaluation and adaptations to the original plan as required.

United Kingdom

The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal was launched in 2001 with the vision that “within 10 to 20 years no one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live,” and two goals: (i) to reduce unemployment and crime, and improve health, skills, housing and the physical environment in poor neighbourhoods, and (ii) to narrow the gap on these measures between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country.”¹²⁶ The strategy was multi-faceted, with a complex governance and implementation structure comprising national oversight; regional networks of government offices responsible for the development and implementation of local neighbourhood renewal strategies and for the support of local strategic partnerships; and local strategic partnerships to bring together the public, private, community, and voluntary sectors. The U.K. government provided flexible funding

through the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund to help address locally-identified problems.¹²⁷

The strategy has been and continues to be subject to comprehensive evaluation. Although there are variations by country and by neighbourhoods (“areas”) within countries, by 2007 the overall key findings for England were as follows:

- There were modest improvements in math and reading scores among elementary school students in the most deprived areas. Effects were not immediate; rather, the impact increased over a four-year period, particularly among boys.¹²⁸
- Unemployment declined slightly in deprived neighbourhoods, by about three per cent, and this improvement was sustained over time.¹²⁷ Areas receiving higher levels of funding saw the greatest reductions in unemployment.¹²⁶
- Crime rates, including violent crime rates, declined from 87.4 per cent to 66.9 per cent in deprived neighbourhoods, compared to a smaller decline in the rest of England (69.3 per cent; 54.0 per cent).
- There was no effect on health (standardized illness ratio, standardized mortality ratio, low birth weight) in deprived neighbourhoods.
- Qualitative evidence indicates improvements in housing and the environment (streets, parks and open spaces, and environmental conditions) in deprived neighbourhoods.

It should be noted that, in 2010, the U.K. government responded to the global financial crisis with extensive cuts to public spending and major structural reforms in many social policy areas, including neighbourhood renewal.¹²⁹ The Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics and Political Science, under the title *Social Policy in a Cold Climate*, has published two reports evaluating of the effects of economic and political changes in the U.K. since 2007, including neighbourhood renewal: *The Coalition’s Social Policy Record: Policy, Spending and Outcomes 2010-2015*¹³⁰ and *Falling Behind, Getting Ahead: The Changing Structure of Inequality in the UK, 2007-2013*.¹³¹

Australia

Launched in 2001, the State of Victoria has now implemented its Neighbourhood Renewal Project in 21 metropolitan and regional areas. Targeting areas with high concentrations of public housing, the project seeks to reduce inequality, increase community cohesion, and make government services more responsive to the needs of communities. Strategies to achieve these goals include increasing pride and participation; enhancing housing and the environment; improving employment, training, and education and strengthening local economies; reducing crime; promoting health and well-being; and increasing access to services. The specific interventions vary from site to site.¹³²

It is widely recognized that evaluation of the project has not been undertaken in a thorough and comprehensive manner. However, a few stand-alone empirical evaluations have produced some interesting and encouraging findings:

One study found that perceptions of well-being were related to quality of services and opportunities in the neighbourhood (e.g., public transport services, employment assistance), safety, community pride and, to a lesser extent, satisfaction with the physical environment. Contrary to expectations, however, perceptions of well-being were slightly negatively associated with connections in the community.¹³³

In a study of two target communities, public housing residents reported an increase in community participation and no change in opportunities for education, health, and social services. Private housing residents, on the other hand, reported a decrease in such opportunities. The quality and accessibility of services were reported to have improved in one community and worsened in the other. In both target communities, residents’ reported increased control over decisions made in their community. In comparison communities, perceptions about controls became more polarized over time. In both the target and comparison communities, there were limited changes in community participation as measured by neighbouring behaviours, and there were no clear patterns with respect to changes in community sense of belonging.¹³⁴

More recently, the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institutes published a robust quasi-experimental evaluation of the intervention in 2012: Cost-effective methods for evaluation of Neighbourhood Renewal programs.¹³⁵ A pre-post outcome study of an urban renewal program in one target social housing project found no statistically significant changes in perceptions of safety, aesthetics, or walkability or in health status of behaviours as a result of a 16-month intervention. The intervention focused on internal and external upgrades to housing (e.g., replacing kitchens and bathrooms, painting, roof repairs, landscaping, etc.), along with community engagement activities (street picnics, community meeting place) and learning and job search programs.

Sense of belonging to the neighbourhood and intention to stay in the community for a number of years increased, however.¹³⁶

Based on research and the evolution of Australia's social inclusion agenda, in 2010 the Australian Social Inclusion Board responded to the government's call for

advice on place-based social inclusion initiatives. The Board argued that while improving the built environment and infrastructure are important, it is insufficient on its own to transform communities, and should be seen as one of the means to the end of increased community capacity. While the context of the Board's recommendations is governance models, the recommendations have broad application for neighbourhood development initiatives in both Australia and Canada. The Board advances specific recommendations for locations with 5,000 or fewer residents. Key recommendations that may be applicable in a Canadian context are summarized as follows:¹³⁷

- Initiatives should focus on building local capacity in three areas: i) economic and human capital capacity (e.g., health, education, skills, and links to employment), ii) physical infrastructure that allows residents to participate in social and economic activity (e.g., public transportation, child care), and iii) social capital, including leadership and

governance capacity. Capacity-building requirements will differ among locations.

- Community economic development is vital to social inclusion. Initiatives should be founded on an understanding of the economic situation in priority locations, including (i) mapping the local community's economic capacity, (ii) involving major local employers and educational providers (or their representatives) in the governance of initiatives, and (iii) local alignment between social and economic policies and programs.
- Long-term, flexible funding is required. If multiple levels of government are involved, they should pool their funding.
- Local governance structures are required to represent the community and drive local engagement and participation in decision-making, and they should be responsible for coordinating the local delivery of services provided by all levels of government, the non-profit sector, and the business sector.

3.2 Effective approaches to strengthening neighbourhoods: Lessons from Canada and around the world

3.2.1 Engaging residents and building neighbourhood capacity for change

Resident engagement and capacity is the cornerstone of any successful neighbourhood strengthening initiative.^{119,138} "Neighbourhood capacity" refers to the ability of residents to work together to find local solutions to particular problems and to collectively influence local and higher-level change. At risk of oversimplification, the key, overarching components of neighbourhood capacity are:¹¹²

- Sense of community – connectedness among residents and recognition of mutuality of circumstance, including a threshold level of collectively held values, norms, and vision.⁸²
- A level of commitment among residents – willingness to participate and the sense of being stakeholders in the outcomes.
- Access to resources – economic, human, physical, and political, within and beyond the neighborhood; and, most importantly, the ability to solve problems via (see for example ¹³⁹⁻¹⁴¹):

- Fostering and sustaining leaders from within the community.
- Building connections beyond the neighbourhood and partnering with non-neighbourhood members.
- Negotiating and facilitating support for initiatives.
- Working collaboratively (e.g., facilitate a group discussion; negotiate conflict; build consensus).

In low-income neighbourhoods, low levels of personal and social capital and social cohesion often mean that, individually or collectively, residents do not have the ability, skills, or resources to respond creatively and effectively to local challenges. Without sufficient neighbourhood capacity, residents are unable to mobilize around issues, to exercise the political clout required to attract public or private resources, and to forge vital connections beyond the neighbourhood ("bridging" social capital).

Although there is no single model for neighbourhood development or capacity building, it generally involves:

- Equipping people with skills and competencies they would not otherwise have.
- Realizing existing skills and developing potential.
- Promoting increased self-confidence.
- Promoting people's ability to take responsibility for identifying and meeting their own and other people's needs.
- Encouraging people to become more involved in their neighbourhood and in the broader society.

In other words, neighbourhood capacity building involves skill development, but it is also intertwined with neighbourhood cohesion and inclusion. Capacity and cohesion are mutually reinforcing.

Getting to the point where capacity building can occur requires that residents are interested and engaged in what is happening in their neighbourhood. Neighbourhood strengthening initiatives are often initiated by non-residents, such as a level of government, which has identified concentrations of poverty and other problems within the neighbourhood. However, as noted earlier, such initiatives must be led by residents, and engaging them in the process can be challenging. Residents may simply lack interest or they may not have sufficient time and other resources to devote significant energy to a project.¹¹⁵

It is generally agreed that neighbourhood strengthening initiatives require the support of external, paid community development staff. Paid staff can assist in capacity-building efforts by:

- Convening and covering the cost of meetings.
- Providing research.
- Teaching and helping with resident engagement strategies, leadership development, project management, and policy development.
- Technical assistance (e.g., social issues, funding).
- Managing information and information flow.¹⁴²

However, as learned from the U.K.'s neighbourhood initiative, both community development staff and social services can inadvertently or deliberately undermine, rather than strengthen, neighbourhood

capacity. When community capacity is low, and a great deal of effort is required to increase it, an influx of social service professionals and services can mean that decisions are made without residents' involvement. It can also mean that representation from residents is "tokenistic." Those in a position of power may use it to portray an inclusive process and provide legitimacy to externally-driven neighbourhood strengthening efforts.¹¹² Davies comments that, in these situations, neighbourhood residents become the audience for the play, rather than its actors or playwrights.¹⁴³

What works to engage residents in neighbourhood change initiatives

Many community engagement guides and tools have been developed, including Tamarack: An Institute for Community Engagement, which features a comprehensive community engagement resource library on its website.

Drawing on lessons learned from its New Deal for Communities Programme, various governmental bodies in the U.K. have produced engagement guides and tools. Scottish government's Effective Interventions Unit produced a particularly helpful, research-based guide: [Effective Engagement: A Guide to Principles and Practice](#).¹⁴⁵ This publication focuses on engaging neighbourhood residents in drug prevention work, but the content is useful for any or multiple issues, and has application in Canada.

CAPACITY BUILDING 1-2-3

Increase basic community capacity by:

- Providing resources and support.
- Developing and diffusing neighbourhood leadership.
- Building processes for resident participation.

Take the first steps toward increasing social cohesion and social capital by engaging residents and building connections among neighbours via:

- Sense of community projects (e.g., neighbourhood spring clean-up, block parties).
- Neighbouring projects (e.g., snow shovelling for seniors).
- Empowerment projects (e.g., small neighbourhood improvement projects that are likely to be successful and involve influencing an external player, such as changing parking zoning or having stop signs installed).

Increase residents' capacity to mobilize for change by:

- Building organizational capacity.
- Building networks outside the neighbourhood.
- Developing policy capacity.

The Country of West Yorkshire produced a concise summary of effective steps in engaging community in neighbourhood change initiatives: [Community engagement: Some lessons from the New Deal for Communities Programme](#).

CASE STUDY: EVALUATION OF A NEIGHBOURHOOD CAPACITY-BUILDING PROGRAM IN LONG BEACH, CA

This evaluation demonstrated that resident training can be an effective means of both engaging residents and increasing their skills to spearhead neighbourhood strengthening initiatives.¹³⁸ This training initiative, entitled the Neighbourhood Leadership Program (NLP), is a 13-session, bi-weekly class delivered primarily in two-hour sessions over six months to existing grassroots neighbourhood leaders to improve quality of life in their neighbourhoods. The city funds the program and social workers, program alumni, and other agency staff deliver it. Translation and childcare are provided. The program culminates in six-person "community project groups" who apply for "mini grants" and then implement their projects (e.g., tree planting, neighbourhood clean-up, health and safety classes).¹⁴⁴ Outcome evaluation of the program revealed increased skills and experiences. Qualitative evaluation found that, over 10 years of alumni, participants had used their training in the following ways: working with neighbours, participating in groups or organizations, starting a project or involvement with community projects, contacting officials when necessary, directing others to resources, growing personally, and starting a group or organization.

Over half of the alumni said that the NLP training contributed to the development of working relationships with neighbors and improvements in neighborhoods. Program participants identified the most useful parts of the training as the Human Relations and Team Building Weekend Retreat and the Day of Discovery, which introduced participants to locations and services in the city and showcased successful projects undertaken by residents of other neighbourhoods.¹³⁸

CASE STUDY: QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF A THREE-YEAR COMMUNITY CAPACITY-BUILDING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

The capacity-building objectives of Being Active Eating Well, a childhood obesity reduction strategy in three neighbourhoods, included broad actions around governance, partnerships, coordination, training and resource allocation. The desired outcomes of this successful project included the development of networks and partnerships, increased local leadership and community ownership, improved skills among health professionals, and the development of sustainable health promotion strategies. The project is now being replicated in five additional neighbourhoods. Key learnings from the project included the following:

- Capacity building approaches should be flexible and adaptable to varying local contexts (for example, age of target group, locality, ethnicity, existing capacity, resources);
- Ensuring that initiatives are community owned and operated and involve reorienting existing resources promotes sustainability;
- Promising resident-led initiatives can be scaled up with an injection of external funds for a defined period of time (for example, three to four years) to enable the organizational, training and resource issues to be oriented toward the desired outcome(s), followed by increased internal organizational funding for these initiatives and reduced external resources;
- A community capacity-building approach has greater potential to strengthen communities than externally designed and applied programs or campaigns.¹⁴⁶

What works to increase neighbourhood capacity

Case studies of comprehensive community initiatives in the U.S. have shown that it is easier to build associational networks among residents by targeting specific neighbourhood issues than by direct efforts

to create intimate ties among individuals.¹¹² As the U.S. Local Initiatives Support Corporation, pointed out,

"[t]he semantics of 'community building' can sometimes give the impression that the task is mostly personal, involving discussions and social gatherings in which people supposedly get to know and trust one another.

*In reality, comprehensive community initiatives generally 'build community' by pursuing concrete projects – anti-crime projects, graffiti removal, policy advocacy, retail promotion, and so on. People's time and trust aren't long engaged by mere talk, no matter how friendly. The activities produce the social network, not the other way around."*¹¹³

3.2.2 Increasing neighbourhood cohesion and social capital

As noted earlier, increasing neighbourhood cohesion is the flip side of capacity building. Neighbourhood cohesion leads to decreased social problems, such as crime and social disorder. For example, Savoie observes that "high neighbourhood crime rates appear to reflect the absence, disruption or ineffectiveness of social networks that enable people to participate in the community and exert social control. Crime appears to be a symptom of social exclusion, with social exclusion in turn blocking neighbourhood residents from exerting social control."¹⁴⁷ (see also ^{73, 148-153}).

As discussed earlier, social control and the monitoring of residents' (and, especially, children and youth's) activities and the willingness to intervene, supports positive child and youth outcomes. This occurs both directly, by helping to keep kids safe and out of trouble, and indirectly, when neighbourhoods are cohesive and supportive of families raising children. High neighbourhood cohesion also increases collective efficacy as residents begin to draw on resources and relationships, grow their own leaders, and build processes

for people to participate in broader community development, from raising funds and building playgrounds to challenging or enforcing municipal bylaws and other legislation.

Clearly, neighbourhood cohesion requires interpersonal connections among residents. Kubisch, et al. note that "[t]he fundamental prerequisite for increasing social capital is no different from the prerequisite for any programmatic outcome: intentionality, in the form of deliberate investment in actions designed to produce the desired outcome."¹²⁴

What works to increase cohesion and social capital

There is some evidence that community programming, services, and events can increase social ties among neighbourhood parents and improve neighbourhood cohesion. An evaluation of a government-funded, community-led community-building initiative in Sacramento County, California provides such evidence. This initiative specifically seeks to create new relationships and increase trust among neighbours.

The evaluation found that parents who had attended parenting programs; events promoting neighbourhood safety (e.g., Neighbourhood Watch); programs promoting early childhood education (e.g., reading programs); arts programming for children; health promotion events (e.g., community bike rides for children); or neighbourhood celebratory events (e.g., holiday festivals, barbecues) in the past three years knew more of their neighbours, visited neighbours' homes, had more friends in the neighbourhood, and rated their neighbourhood much more positively than parents who had not attended any programs or events. For example, they responded positively to questions such as: "People in my neighbourhood can be trusted" and "My neighbourhood is a good place to raise children." These parents were also more likely to make use of community-based support services (e.g., food programs, utility bill assistance) and educational programs (e.g., ESL classes, family literacy programs, job training), and to have higher personal self-efficacy scores than parents who did not attend programs or events.¹⁵⁴

- A handful of empirical studies from the U.S. indicated that community gardens can provide a positive venue for social interaction¹⁵⁵ and increase neighbourhood satisfaction.¹⁵⁶ Similar findings have been reported in Canada. A Toronto study reported that community gardens increased neighbourhood pride and social interaction among participants.¹⁵⁷ Interestingly, a recent study on community gardening and social capital in Flint, Michigan found that within the neighbourhood, social ties, trust, and reciprocity, along with neighbourhood satisfaction, were higher among residents who participated in community garden projects than among those who did not. They were higher still among those who participated in both gardens and neighbourhood meetings about a neighbourhood problem or neighbourhood improvement, however.¹⁵⁸
- Neighbourhood groups and organizations can also generate social capital, although there are only a few, older empirical studies to substantiate this theory. For example, increased sense of community has been associated with participation in block associations,⁸² sports association, cultural organizations, and other groups.¹⁵⁹ At least one study has shown that the higher the level of a resident's involvement, the greater his sense of community, as well as his leadership competence, knowledge and skills in neighbourhood development, and organizational (although not neighbourhood) sense of collective efficacy.¹⁶⁰
- There is also evidence that resident participation in specific projects to improve the built or natural environment in a neighbourhood increases participants' sense of community, positive social ties and frequency of interaction with neighbours.¹⁶¹ This is consistent with a handful of recent American studies that show that working toward change in neighbourhood conditions ("neighbourhood activism") may be more effective in increasing social ties within the neighbourhood, improving individual psychological well-being, and creating sense of efficacy than volunteering to provide services¹⁶² (see also ^{129, 130}).
- There appear to be no evaluations of the effects of improvements to neighbourhoods' built or natural environment on social capital or social cohesion within the neighbourhood. However, research from Montreal does reveal clear associations between seniors' social participation and neighbourhood walkability and access to services and amenities²⁸ (see also ^{27, 163}). Australian research has identified an association between good quality services and amenities and participation in local community groups, leading the researchers to recommend government investments in services and recreational facilities as a means of promoting social cohesion,¹⁶⁴ and between neighbourhood walkability and sense of community.¹⁶⁵

Other neighbourhood features associated with sense of community include perceptions of neighbourhood safety, encountering neighbours while out in the neighbourhood, and having interesting or attractive sites in the neighbourhood (see for example ¹⁶⁶).

3.2.3 Mixed evidence on "social mixing"

"Social mix" policies seek to increase socioeconomic and, sometimes, ethnocultural diversity in a neighbourhood or larger urban area. This is not a new concept; it has roots in 19th century Britain and has played a role in Canadian urban planning since the 1950s. A desire to encourage social mix was one driver of Canada's social housing policies until 1992 when, as part of the federal government's withdrawal from the social housing policy sector, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) determined that income-mixed social housing (i.e., co-op housing, subsidized housing) was too expensive and provided no benefit to low-income residents.¹⁶⁷ However, since the 1990s, increasing social mix has been an explicit or underlying goal of strategies around the world to decrease spatially concentrated poverty. Champions of social mix in Canada at the municipal and neighbourhood levels have included Jane Jacobs and, more recently, Richard Florida.

Social mixing is intended to "[b]reak up and deconcentrat[e] social housing to recreate communities with a more heterogeneous

socioeconomic mix. Residents are seen as instruments to facilitate less stigmatised and more dynamic and cohesive communities."¹⁶⁸ cited in ¹⁶⁹. Briefly, the desired outcomes of social mixing include: (i) improvements to neighbourhoods via increased social cohesion with consequent benefits, including reduced crime and anti-social behaviour, and higher-income neighbours to support more and better amenities through political influence and taxation, and to attract desirable commercial growth; and (ii) countering the negative effects of spatially concentrated poverty on low-income residents by increasing their social ties with higher SES people, resulting in the expected attendant positive outcomes.¹⁶⁹

For the most part, in the U.S., the U.K., Australia, and Canada, three methods of increasing social mix have been undertaken: dispersal by marginally reducing the number of social housing dwellings in a neighbourhood (e.g., by selling social housing to tenants or private purchasers or by increasing the quantity of private dwellings); diversifying by ensuring that new

housing developments have a proportion of social housing properties; and dispersal by relocating residents from concentrated areas of social housing to other social housing dispersed throughout the city.¹⁷⁰

A great deal of research completed in the past few years has explored the pros and cons of social mixing, with mixed findings. As just one example, a systematic review of studies from the U.K. identified some positive effects on social outcomes, mixed effects on economic outcomes, and little effect on health and education outcomes.¹⁷¹ The effects of social mixing in Canada are still murky. Existing research appears to concentrate almost exclusively on problems resulting from gentrification in large cities over several decades in the absence of strong social housing policy (see for example ¹⁷²). The only exception appears to be a qualitative study of tenure mix in Toronto's Regent Park Community. This study reported high levels of neighbourhood satisfaction among both low- and higher-income residents, but low levels of social interaction between them.¹⁷³

What works to generate positive outcomes in social mixing

Summarizing the recent research from around the world, Bolt and van Kempen¹⁶⁹ claim that social mixing can be effective on many fronts, but positive outcomes from socially mixed neighbourhoods depend on several factors:

- High quality built architecture (e.g., buildings allow for natural light, good sound insulation) and no clear architectural

distinction between private and social housing in terms of style, size and quality.

- Social housing and neighbourhood common areas (e.g., streets, parks) are well maintained.
- Considerable investment in community development and high quality social programs.
- Public spaces that are well maintained and designed to encourage use by all residents.
- Good quality amenities, including facilities where residents can come together.

- Desirable and good quality retail industries.
- A range of housing prices to enable lower-income residents to move out of social housing, purchase private housing, and remain in the neighbourhood, even when they can afford to move elsewhere, to promote social cohesion.
- Avoid a very high level of income diversity.
- Distribute social housing throughout the neighbourhood, rather than create a ‘superblock’ of social housing.¹⁶⁹

3.2.4 Improving amenities, programs, and services

Low income neighbourhoods require but often lack amenities, programs, and services. These include family support, child and youth development programs, social services and health care; recreation facilities and programs, and libraries; local employment; and public transit. While some of these resources may be present, they may not be of sufficient quality or may be inaccessible to residents for various reasons. Lack of accessible, quality childcare available very early in the morning compounds these challenges.

Neighbourhood leaders in conjunction with funders external to the community can successfully spearhead efforts to improve service quality and accessibility. They may need help from funders and/or elected officials if improvements require relocating existing services, developing new services, or integrating existing and new services. For example, existing services may include cross-community services, such as food assistance programs, arts and youth development programs; government services such as provincial Seniors and Community Supports, community health centres and long-term care facilities, municipal Community and Neighbourhood Services, and not-for-profit social service agencies.

Vital to the long-term success and “community ownership” of such initiatives is the involvement of community residents in identifying needs, engaging other residents, and developing and implementing solutions. This requires community capacity, as described above. Clearly, some of the types of amenities and services required in a given

neighbourhood, and the ways in which they are developed or acquired, will depend on the neighbourhood’s demographic mix and the capacity of residents. For example, a neighbourhood with a high concentration of seniors may require improved public transit in the form of neighbourhood shuttle busses, or may want to re-zone part of the neighbourhood to allow for the construction of a seniors’ residence. In this case, the seniors may have sufficient capacity to organize a change initiative with little external support. On the other hand, a neighbourhood in which many families with young children live may need extensive support to bring family support services or child care into or near their neighbourhood.

Community hubs as a promising way to improve neighbourhood amenities, programs, and services

In the context of this paper, the definition of “community hubs” borrows from the United Way of Calgary. Community hub refers to co-location initiatives that promote economies of scale (through resource sharing and cost efficiencies); economies of scope (resource and cost efficiencies across systems); and perhaps most importantly, transformation of the relationship between service providers and community members from a model in which community members are recipients of service to one in which community members are actively involved in service design and delivery as part of a broader neighbourhood development process.¹⁷⁴

The ideal form, structure, and governance of a community hub depend on the needs, capacity, and desires of residents, with individual programs “situated and coordinated within the broader goals of the community hub.”¹⁷⁴

Research demonstrates the efficiencies of co-location for agencies (although other research on co-location unrelated to community hubs has identified improvements in service accessibility and, sometimes, quality). That being said, integrated community hubs may have capacity building and social cohesion benefits. Inferring from the experiences of the United Way of Toronto’s Building Strong Neighbourhoods Project, which has integrated community hubs into some of its target neighbourhoods, the United Way of Calgary notes that the hubs have served to engage neighbourhood residents and strengthen their capacity through their involvement in planning, delivering and evaluating services provided through the hubs. In addition, the hubs are required to provide free community space, ensuring a venue for residents to come together for a range of purposes.¹⁷⁴ See [How to Hub: Community Hub Development Toolkit](#)¹⁷⁵ for more information.

3.2.5 Community economic development

As defined by the Canadian CED Network, community economic development (CED) is

“action by people locally to create economic opportunities and better social conditions, particularly for those who are most disadvantaged. CED is an approach that recognizes that economic, environmental and social challenges are interdependent, complex and ever-changing. To be effective, solutions must be rooted in local knowledge and led by community members. CED promotes holistic approaches, addressing individual, community and regional levels, recognizing that these levels are interconnected.”¹⁷⁶

Very briefly, CED strategies are generally initiated and operated by community economic development organizations (CEDOs) in collaboration with the federal and provincial governments and the private sector. CEDOs work for structural change, seek to attract new businesses to the community, and encourage training and employment for local residents. Depending on neighbourhood capacity, CED strategies can take more than 10 years to come to fruition. Each stage of development requires different forms of support to nurture the neighbourhood from a point of systematic self-evaluation to the final stage of fostering financial capital through various means, such as tax incentive programs and community-based loan funds.¹⁷⁷ Very large and comprehensive community economic development strategies are one of the cornerstones of neighbourhood building programs in the U.S., the U.K., and some neighbourhoods in Canada.

2020 update

The table below is organized alphabetically by type of intervention. There is some overlap in the types of interventions included in each category. The links provide access to full-text resources as they are available. The table is a curated list of resources, it is not a comprehensive catalogue of all research in each area. The table includes Best-Practice Reviews and research summaries. To be included here, organizations that produce the best-practice reviews have to operate independently

As noted earlier, CED initiatives have not generally succeeded in decreasing low income at the neighbourhood-level. However, there are many examples of successful CED initiatives that have assisted or shown promise of assisting individuals in low-income neighbourhoods to increase their income and their overall life chances. Examples of successful initiatives include self-employment and community-based finance strategies, micro-lending programs, often in conjunction with skill-building opportunities (job training, academic upgrading, accreditation, life skills), and removing direct barriers to working (e.g., child care, transportation). Neechi Foods in Winnipeg, profiled, is a true Canadian CED success story.

Comprehensive CED initiatives require either strong mentorship or a relatively high level of neighbourhood capacity in several domains:¹⁷⁸

- Resource capacity – Ability to acquire and manage funding from grants, contracts, loans and other sources.
- Organizational capacity – capability of internal operations – Management, staff skills, board role and capacity, ability to manage finances.
- Networking capacity – Ability to work with other institutions both within and outside the community.
- Programmatic capacity – Ability to design and deliver programs.

from private interests and have a clearly articulated process and quality control. The research summaries include literature reviews, which are narrative summaries of existing research on a specific topic, and systematic reviews, which use more rigorous methods to collect and assess studies and synthesize findings. It also includes meta-analyses, which use a type of statistical analysis that combines the results of multiple similar scientific studies to determine whether the overall effect is positive or

- Political capacity – Ability to represent neighbourhood residents credibly and advocate effectively on their behalf in larger political arenas.

NEECHI FOODS CO-OP WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

Neechi Foods is a flourishing business in Winnipeg’s North End, one of the poorest postal codes in Canada. Aboriginal organizations in Winnipeg worked with the Métis Economic Development Training Program in the 1980s to create an Aboriginal-owned and controlled business with a view to providing employment for Aboriginal people in the local community and improving access to healthy, affordable food. Full operations began in 1990, and Neechi Foods has since grown into a thriving enterprise offering a wide range of local and specialty products and consistently providing stable employment.¹⁷⁹ With money raised by selling shares to the public, Neechi Foods has just expanded into new space, which is soon to house the Neechi Commons Community Business Complex that will include a supermarket, cafeteria, bakery, fish market, specialty foods boutique, books, crafts, music and clothing, a seasonal farmers’ market and hardware.¹⁸⁰ Neechi Foods also sparked the development of the Northern Star Worker Co-op, whose members sew traditional and contemporary Star blankets, which are sold at the store.¹⁸¹ (The term ‘aboriginal’ is used in this section because that is what is used in the cited references.)

negative. Research summaries come from peer-reviewed journal articles as well as well-documented grey literature including government agencies, best practice sites, and systematic review organizations (e.g. Cochrane Library, Campbell Collaboration) published since 2013.

Table 2: What works by type of intervention

Type of intervention	Resources
Asset-based community development	<p>Nurture Development Reports “Proof of Impact,” Reports From Communities Using Asset-Based Community Development¹⁸²</p> <p>Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) Institute: University Partnered Research and Community Development Institute Where ABCD was Originally Developed, Provides Toolkits and Other Resources¹⁸³</p> <p>ABCD Canada Resources: Canada Focused Parallel to the ABCD Institute, Provides Canadian Toolkits and Other Resources¹⁸⁴</p>
Strengthening neighbourhoods and neighbourhood revitalization schemes	<p>Strengthening Communities with Neighbourhood Data¹</p> <p>Building Resilient Neighbourhoods¹⁸⁵</p> <p>Catalyzing Neighbourhood Revitalization Through Strengthening Civic Infrastructure¹⁹⁸</p> <p>Connecting and Strengthening Communities In Places For Health and Well-Being¹⁸⁶</p> <p>A Systematic Review of Interventions to Boost Social Relations Through Improvements In Community Infrastructure⁸⁵</p> <p>The Limits of Local Redistribution: Neighbourhood Regeneration Initiatives In Toronto and Phoenix¹⁸⁷</p> <p>The Influence of HOPE VI Neighbourhood Revitalization on Neighbourhood-Based Physical Activity: A Mixed-Methods Approach¹⁸⁸</p>
Engaging residents and building neighbourhood capacity	<p>Community Hubs Initiative¹⁸⁹</p> <p>The Healthy Native Community Fellowship¹⁹⁰</p> <p>How to Hub: Community Hub Development Toolkit¹⁷⁵</p> <p>Lending Libraries¹⁹¹</p> <p>Plan-h Tools and Resources¹⁹²</p> <p>Increasing Collective Efficacy and Social Capital At Crime Hot Spots: New Crime Control Tools for Police¹⁹³</p>
Community economic development	<p>The Canadian Community Economic Development Network Tools and Publications¹⁹⁴</p> <p>International Economic Development Council – Publications¹⁹⁵</p>
Place-based policy, neighbourhood change and inequality	<p>Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership Library¹⁹⁶</p> <p>The What, Where and When of Place-Based Housing Policy’s Neighbourhood Effects¹⁹⁷</p>

In this document:

- “Evidence-based” means that a program or practice has been tested in a well-designed and methodologically sound experimental (randomized controlled trial (RCT)) or quasi-experimental study (and, ideally, multiple studies and replicated in more than one site), and has been shown to produce significant reductions in poor outcomes or associated risk factors or significant increases in positive outcomes or associated protective factors.
- “Best practices” refer to programs or components of programs or delivery methods that have been identified as effective (i.e., produce significant reductions in poor outcomes or associated risk factors or significant increases in positive outcomes or associated protective factors) by repeated methodologically sound studies using an experimental (RCT) or quasi-experimental design.
- “Promising practices” refer to programs or components of programs or delivery methods that have been identified as effective (“effective” as defined above) in at least one well-designed and methodologically sound study using at least a pre-post design with a large sample of participants that has been subject to peer review.
- “Prevention” means creating conditions or personal attributes that strengthen the healthy development, well-being, and safety of individuals across the lifespan and/or communities.

Prevention programs deter the onset of a problem, intervene at a very early stage in its development or mitigate risk factors/strengthen protective factors. In the research-based risk and protection prevention paradigm, prevention occurs by reducing risk factors and increasing protective factors.
- “Risk and protective factors – A risk factor can be defined as a characteristic at the biological, psychological, family, community or cultural level that precedes and is associated with a higher likelihood of problem outcomes. Conversely, a protective factor can be defined as a characteristic at the biological, psychological, family, community or cultural level that is associated with a lower likelihood of problem outcomes or that reduces the negative impact of a risk factor.

Reference list

- ¹ Kingsley GT, Coulton CJ, Petit KLS. Strengthening Communities with Neighbourhood Data. Published online 2014. Accessed April 22, 2020. https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/13805_urban-kingsley.pdf
- ² Jenks M, Dempsey N. Defining the neighbourhood: Challenges for empirical research. *Town Planning Review*. 2007;78:153-177. doi:10.3828/tpr.78.2.4
- ³ Atkinson R, Kintrea K. Disentangling Area Effects: Evidence from Deprived and Non-deprived Neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies*. 2001;38(12):2277-2298. doi:10.1080/00420980120087162
- ⁴ Cook D. *Statistics Canada Data Provided By*. Calgary Neighbourhoods, The City of Calgary
- ⁵ Heisz A, McLeod L, Statistics Canada, Business and Labour Market Analysis Division. *Low-Income in Census Metropolitan Areas, 1980-2000*. Statistics Canada, Business and Labour Market Analysis Division; 2004. http://www.urbancenter.utoronto.ca/pdfs/elibrary/StatsCan_Low-Income-in-Citi.pdf
- ⁶ Infrastructure Canada. *Research Note: A Brief Review of Research on Neighbourhoods in Canada*; 2005. <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Infrastructure-Canada-2005-Brief-review-of-research-on-nhoods-in-Canada.pdf>
- ⁷ Heisz A, McLeod L. Low income in census metropolitan areas. 2004, Statistics Canada, Business and Labour Market Analysis Division. http://www.urbancenter.utoronto.ca/pdfs/elibrary/StatsCan_Low-Income-in-Citi.pdf
- ⁸ Myles J, Picot G, Pyper W. Neighbourhood Inequality in Canadian Cities. :38.
- ⁹ Chen W-H, Myles J, Picot G. Why Have Poorer Neighbourhoods Stagnated Economically while the Richer Have Flourished? Neighbourhood Income Inequality in Canadian Cities. *Urban Studies*. 2012;49(4):877-896. doi:10.1177/0042098011408142
- ¹⁰ Langlois A, Marois C. Quality of location and quality of life in central Montreal neighbourhoods. *CMHC*. 2004;CMHC Research Highlights(Socio-economic Series 04-005).
- ¹¹ Sun Y. *Development of Neighbourhood Quality of Life Indicators*. University Institute for Social Research, University of Saskatchewan; 2002:69.
- ¹² Peters A. Is your community child-friendly? *CANADIAN SOCIAL TRENDS*. 2002;(11):4.
- ¹³ Roosa MW, Jones S, Tein J-Y, Cree W. Prevention Science and Neighborhood Influences on Low-Income Children's Development: Theoretical and Methodological Issues. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2003;31(1-2):55-72. doi:10.1023/A:1023070519597
- ¹⁴ MacDonnell S, Embuldeniya D, Ratanshi F, United Way of Greater Toronto. *Poverty by Postal Code: The Geography of Neighbourhood Poverty, City of Toronto, 1981-2001*. United Way Toronto; 2004. Accessed July 13, 2020. <http://www.deslibris.ca/ID/215162>
- ¹⁵ Galster G. Investigating behavioural impacts of poor neighbourhoods: towards new data and analytic strategies. *Housing Studies*. 2003;18(6):893-914. doi:10.1080/0267303032000135492
- ¹⁶ Sawatsky J, Stroick SM. *Thresholds for Locating Affordable Housing: Applying the Literature to the Local Context*. The City of Calgary, Community and Neighbourhood Services; 2005:72. <https://homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/svmbbczv.pdf>
- ¹⁷ Townshend I, Miller B, Evans L. Socio-spatial Polarization in an Age of Income Inequality: An Exploration of Neighbourhood Change in Calgary's "Three Cities." Published online March 2018. Accessed April 21, 2020. <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/documents/2018/04/socio-spatial-polarization-in-calgary.pdf>
- ¹⁸ What is Happening to my Neighbourhood: The socio-spatial restructuring of Vancouver, Calgary, Toronto, and Montreal 1970 to 2015. J. David presented at the: Accessed April 21, 2020. <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/documents/2017/12/van-cal-tor-mont-1970-2015.pdf>
- ¹⁹ Galster GC. The mechanism(s) of neighbourhood effects : theory, evidence, and policy implications. In: *Neighbourhood Effects Research: New Perspectives*. ; 2012:23-56. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-2309-2
- ²⁰ Ross N, Oliver L, Villeneuve P. The Contribution of Neighbourhood Material and Social Deprivation to Survival: A 22-Year Follow-up of More than 500,000 Canadians. *IJERPH*. 2013;10(4):1378-1391. doi:10.3390/ijerph10041378
- ²¹ Wilkins R, Berthelot J-M, Ng E. *Trends in Mortality by Neighbourhood Income in Urban Canada from 1971 to 1996*. Statistics Canada; 2002:1-26. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/82-003-s/2002001/pdf/82-003-s2002007-eng.pdf?st=hqRmMRvk>
- ²² Ellen IG, Mijanovich T, Dillman K-N. Neighborhood Effects on Health: Exploring the Links and Assessing the Evidence. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 2001;23(3-4):391-408. doi:10.1111/0735-2166.00096
- ²³ Cooper M. *Report on the National Symposium on Health and Housing: A Call to Action*; 2003.
- ²⁴ Bassett E, Moore S. Social capital and depressive symptoms: The association of psychosocial and network dimensions of social capital with depressive symptoms in Montreal, Canada. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2013;86:96-102. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.03.005

- ²⁵ Walter Rasugu Omariba D. Neighbourhood characteristics, individual attributes and self-rated health among older Canadians. *Health & Place*. 2010;16(5):986-995. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2010.06.003
- ²⁶ Yen IH, Michael YL, Perdue L. Neighborhood Environment in Studies of Health of Older Adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2009;37(5):455-463. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.06.022
- ²⁷ Richard L, Gauvin L, Kestens Y, et al. Neighborhood Resources and Social Participation Among Older Adults: Results From the VoisiNuage Study. *J Aging Health*. 2013;25(2):296-318. doi:10.1177/0898264312468487
- ²⁸ Richard L, Gauvin L, Gosselin C, Laforest S. Staying connected: neighbourhood correlates of social participation among older adults living in an urban environment in Montreal, Quebec. *Health Promotion International*. 2008;24(1):46-57. doi:10.1093/heapro/dan039
- ²⁹ Philibert MD, Pampalon R, Hamel D, Daniel M. Interactions between neighborhood characteristics and individual functional status in relation to disability among Québec urbanites. *Disability and Health Journal*. 2013;6(4):361-368. doi:10.1016/j.dhjo.2013.02.004
- ³⁰ Soubhi H, Raina P, Kohen D. Effects of neighbourhood, family and child behaviour on childhood injury in Canada. *Working Paper Series*. Published online 2001.
- ³¹ Cushon JA, Vu LTH, Janzen BL, Muhajarine N. Neighborhood Poverty Impacts Children's Physical Health and Well-Being Over Time: Evidence From the Early Development Instrument. *Early Education & Development*. 2011;22(2):183-205. doi:10.1080/10409280902915861
- ³² Vu LTH, Muhajarine N. Neighbourhood Effects on Hospitalization in Early Childhood. *Can J Public Health*. 2010;101(2):119-123. doi:10.1007/BF03404355
- ³³ Nichol M, Janssen I, Pickett W. Associations Between Neighborhood Safety, Availability of Recreational Facilities, and Adolescent Physical Activity Among Canadian Youth. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*. 2010;7(4):442-450. doi:10.1123/jpah.7.4.442
- ³⁴ Matheson FI, LaFreniere MC, White HL, Moineddin R, Dunn JR, Glazier RH. Influence of neighborhood deprivation, gender and ethno-racial origin on smoking behavior of Canadian youth. *Preventive Medicine*. 2011;52(5):376-380. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2011.02.011
- ³⁵ Boyle M, Lipman E. Do places matter? A multilevel analysis of geographic variations in child behaviour in Canada. *HRDC Working Paper*. Published online 1998.
- ³⁶ Kohen DE, Leventhal T, Dahinten VS, McIntosh CN. Neighborhood Disadvantage: Pathways of Effects for Young Children. *Child Development*. 2008;79(1):156-169. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01117.x
- ³⁷ Gayles JG, Coatsworth JD, Pantin HM, Szapocznik J. Parenting and Neighborhood Predictors of Youth Problem Behaviors Within Hispanic Families: The Moderating Role of Family Structure. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 2009;31(3):277-296. doi:10.1177/0739986309338891
- ³⁸ Jones C, Canada, Canada, eds. *Poverty, Social Capital, Parenting and Child Outcomes in Canada: Final Report*. Applied Research Branch, Human Resources Development Canada; 2002.
- ³⁹ Pinderhughes EE, Nix R, Foster EM, Jones D. Parenting in Context: Impact of Neighborhood Poverty, Residential Stability, Public Services, Social Networks, and Danger on Parental Behaviors. *J Marriage and Family*. 2001;63(4):941-953. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00941.x
- ⁴⁰ Connor S, Brink S. *Understanding the Early Years: Community Impacts on Child Development*. Human Resources Development Canada, Applied Research Branch; 1999.
- ⁴¹ Buck N. Identifying Neighbourhood Effects on Social Exclusion. *Urban Studies*. 2001;38(12):2251-2275. doi:10.1080/00420980120087153
- ⁴² Dietz RD. The estimation of neighborhood effects in the social sciences: An interdisciplinary approach. *Social Science Research*. 2002;31(4):539-575. doi:10.1016/S0049-089X(02)00005-4
- ⁴³ Overman HG. Neighbourhood Effects in Large and Small Neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies*. 2002;39(1):117-130. doi:10.1080/00420980220099104
- ⁴⁴ Kohen DE, Hertzman C, Brooks-Gunn J. *Neighbourhood Influences on Children's School Readiness*. 1st ed. 1998. Human Resources Development Canada, Applied Research Branch; 1998.
- ⁴⁵ Chilman CS, Brooks-Gunn J, Duncan GJ, Aber JL. Neighborhood Poverty: Context and Consequences for Children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1999;61(1):259. doi:10.2307/353903
- ⁴⁶ Willms JD. *Ten Hypotheses about Socioeconomic Gradients and Community Differences in Children's Development Outcomes: Final Report*. Applied Research Branch, Human Resources Development Canada; 2003.
- ⁴⁷ Hertzman C, McLean A. S, Kohen E. D, Dunn J, Evans T. *Early Development in Vancouver: Report of the Community Asset Mapping Project (CAMP)*. Human Early Learning Partnership; 2002. <http://blogs.ubc.ca/newproposals/files/2009/03/vancouverreport.pdf>
- ⁴⁸ Lloyd JEV, Li L, Hertzman C. Early experiences matter: Lasting effect of concentrated disadvantage on children's language and cognitive outcomes. *Health & Place*. 2010;16(2):371-380. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2009.11.009

- ⁴⁹ Oreopoulos P. The Long-Run Consequences of Living in a Poor Neighborhood. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 2003;118(4):1533-1575. doi:10.1162/003355303322552865
- ⁵⁰ Friedrichs J. Context effects of poverty neighbourhoods on residents. In: *Housing in Europe*. ; 1997.
- ⁵¹ Kawabata M. Access to jobs : transportation barriers faced by low-skilled autoless workers in U.S. metropolitan areas. Published online 2002. Accessed July 13, 2020. <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/8520>
- ⁵² Kasarda JD, Friedrichs J, Ehlers KE. Urban Industrial Restructuring and Minority Problems in the US and Germany. Carolina Population Center. Published 1992. Accessed July 13, 2020. <https://www.cpc.unc.edu/resources/publications/bib/177/>
- ⁵³ Ley D, Smith H. Relations between Deprivation and Immigrant Groups in Large Canadian Cities. *Urban Studies*. 2000;37(1):37-62. doi:10.1080/0042098002285
- ⁵⁴ Hou F, Chen J. Neighbourhood low income, income inequality and health in Toronto. *Health Rep*. 2003;14(2):21-34.
- ⁵⁵ Séguin A-M, Germain A. The Social Sustainability of Montreal: A Local or a State Matter? In: Polese M, Stren R, eds. *The Social Sustainability of Cities*. University of Toronto Press; 2000. doi:10.3138/9781442682399-005
- ⁵⁶ Séguin A-M, Divay G. Urban Poverty: Fostering Sustainable and Supportive Communities. Canadian Policy Research Networks; 2002.
- ⁵⁷ Freiler C. Why strong neighbourhoods matter: Implications for Policy and Practice. *Strong Neighbourhoods TaskForce*. Published online 2004:43.
- ⁵⁸ Friedrichs J, Galster G, Musterd S. Neighbourhood effects on social opportunities: the European and American research and policy context. *Housing Studies*. 2003;18(6):797-806. doi:10.1080/0267303032000156291
- ⁵⁹ CMHC. *Residential Intensification Studies. Built Projects. Garrison Woods, Calgary, Alberta*. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; 2006.
- ⁶⁰ Diamond J. Urban Form, Transportation, and Sustainability. *Ideas That Matter*. 2007;4(1):4-7.
- ⁶¹ Evans GW. Child Development and the Physical Environment. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2006;57(1):423-451. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190057
- ⁶² Grammenos F, Tasker-Brown J. Residential Street Pattern Design. Published online 2004. <https://www.irbnet.de/daten/iconda/CIB4226.pdf>
- ⁶³ Checklist of the Qualities of the New Urbanism Design Philosophy. McMaster University Sustainable Communities Research Group. www.eng.mcmaster.ca/civil/sustain/designparam/checklist.htm
- ⁶⁴ Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. *Learning from Suburbia: Residential Street Pattern Design*. CMHC; 2000.
- ⁶⁵ Wells NM, Evans GW. Nearby Nature: A Buffer of Life Stress among Rural Children. *Environment and Behavior*. 2003;35(3):311-330. doi:10.1177/0013916503035003001
- ⁶⁶ Taylor AF, Kuo FE, Sullivan WC. VIEWS OF NATURE AND SELF-DISCIPLINE: EVIDENCE FROM INNER CITY CHILDREN. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 2002;22(1-2):49-63. doi:10.1006/jevp.2001.0241
- ⁶⁷ Taylor AF, Kuo FE, Sullivan WC. Coping with add: The Surprising Connection to Green Play Settings. *Environment and Behavior*. 2001;33(1):54-77. doi:10.1177/00139160121972864
- ⁶⁸ Coley RL, Sullivan WC, Kuo FE. Where Does Community Grow?: The Social Context Created by Nature in Urban Public Housing. *Environment and Behavior*. 1997;29(4):468-494. doi:10.1177/001391659702900402
- ⁶⁹ Building Community Identity and Pride. Accessed July 13, 2020. <https://www.creativecity.ca/publications/making-the-case/building-community-identity-and-pride.php>
- ⁷⁰ Dines N. Public spaces and social relations in East London. JRF. Published September 1, 2006. Accessed July 13, 2020. <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/public-spaces-and-social-relations-east-london>
- ⁷¹ Worpole K, Knox K. The social value of public spaces. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Published April 24, 2007. Accessed July 13, 2020. <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/social-value-public-spaces>
- ⁷² Watson S, Studdert D. *Markets as Sites for Social Interaction: Spaces of Diversity*. Published for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation by Policy Press; 2006.
- ⁷³ Forrest R, Kearns A. Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*. 2001;38(12):2125-2143. doi:10.1080/00420980120087081
- ⁷⁴ de Souza Briggs X. Moving up versus moving out: Neighborhood effects in housing mobility programs. *Housing Policy Debate*. 1997;8(1):195-234. doi:10.1080/10511482.1997.9521252
- ⁷⁵ Bradford N. Why Cities Matter: Policy Research Perspectives for Canada. Published online 2002. <http://www.urbancentre.utoronto.ca/pdfs/home/debates/CPRNWhyCigties.pdf>

- ⁷⁶ Schuller T. *The Complementary Roles of Human and Social Capital*. Birkbeck College, University of London; 2001. <https://www.oecd.org/innovation/research/1825424.pdf>
- ⁷⁷ Beauvais C, Jenson J. Social Cohesion: Updating the State of the Research. Published online 2002. http://cprn3.library.carleton.ca/documents/12949_en.pdf
- ⁷⁸ Government of Canada Department of Justice. Inclusion for All: A Canadian Roadmap to Social Cohesion. Published April 23, 2001. Accessed July 14, 2020. <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/csj-sjc/jsp-sjp/tr01-rt01/index.html>
- ⁷⁹ Wilkinson D. The Multidimensional Nature of Social Cohesion: Psychological Sense of Community, Attraction, and Neighboring. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2007;40(3-4):214-229. doi:10.1007/s10464-007-9140-1
- ⁸⁰ Brodsky AE, O'Campo PJ, Aronson RE. PSOC in community context: Multi-Level correlates of a measure of psychological sense of community in low-income, urban neighborhoods. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 1999;27(6):659-679. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6629(199911)27:6<659::AID-JCOP3>3.0.CO;2-#
- ⁸¹ Buckner JC. The development of an instrument to measure neighborhood cohesion. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 1988;16(6):771-791. doi:10.1007/BF00930892
- ⁸² Chavis DM, Wandersman A. Sense of community in the urban environment: A catalyst for participation and community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 1990;18(1):55-81. doi:10.1007/BF00922689
- ⁸³ Farrell SJ, Aubry T, Coulombe D. Neighborhoods and neighbors: Do they contribute to personal well-being? *J Community Psychol*. 2004;32(1):9-25. doi:10.1002/jcop.10082
- ⁸⁴ Kim J, Kaplan R. Physical and Psychological Factors in Sense of Community: New Urbanist Kentlands and Nearby Orchard Village. *Environment and Behavior*. 2004;36(3):313-340. doi:10.1177/0013916503260236
- ⁸⁵ Bagnall A, South J, Di Martino S, et al. *A Systematic Review of Interventions to Boost Social Relations through Improvements in Community Infrastructure*. Leeds Beckett University; 2018. <http://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/4998/1/Places-spaces-people-well-being-full-report-MAY2018.pdf>
- ⁸⁶ Sharpe EK. Targeted neighbourhood social policy: a critical analysis. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*. 2013;5(2):158-171. doi:10.1080/19407963.2013.811018
- ⁸⁷ Slater T. Your Life Chances Affect Where You Live: A Critique of the 'Cottage Industry' of Neighbourhood Effects Research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 2013;37(2):367-387. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2013.01215.x <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59a7762f2994ca11765ff510/t/5a78b347419202bce0a8a4d2/1517859655882/Slater+--+2013+--+Your+Life+Chances+Affect+Where+You+Live+A+Critique+of+the+%27Cottage+Industry%27+of+Neighbourhood+Effects+Research-annotated.pdf>
- ⁸⁸ Bradford N. Neighbourhood Revitalization in Canada: Towards Place-Based Policy Solutions. In: Manley D, van Ham M, Bailey N, Simpson L, Maclennan D, eds. *Neighbourhood Effects or Neighbourhood Based Problems? A Policy Context*. Springer Netherlands; 2013:157-176. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-6695-2_8
- ⁸⁹ Manley D, van Ham M, Bailey N, Simpson L, Maclennan D. *Neighbourhood Effects or Neighbourhood Based Problems? A Policy Context*. In: Manley D, van Ham M, Bailey N, Simpson L, Maclennan D, eds. *Neighbourhood Effects or Neighbourhood Based Problems? A Policy Context*. Springer Netherlands; 2013:1-23. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-6695-2_1
- ⁹⁰ Lee S, Lin J. Natural Amenities, Neighbourhood Dynamics, and Persistence in the Spatial Distribution of Income. *Rev Econ Stud*. 2018;85(1):663-694. doi:10.1093/restud/rdx018
- ⁹¹ Koschinsky J, Talen E. Location Efficiency and Affordability: A National Analysis of Walkable Access and HUD-Assisted Housing. *Housing Policy Debate*. 2016;26(4-5):835-863. doi:10.1080/10511482.2015.1137965
- ⁹² Fuller D, Engler-Stringer R, Muhajarine N. Examining food purchasing patterns from sales data at a full-service grocery store intervention in a former food desert. *Preventive Medicine Reports*. 2015;2:164-169. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2015.02.012. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4721426/>
- ⁹³ Calogiuri G, Chroni S. The impact of the natural environment on the promotion of active living: An integrative systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(1):873. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-873. <https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-14-873>
- ⁹⁴ Flouri E, Midouhas E, Joshi H. The role of urban neighbourhood green space in children's emotional and behavioural resilience. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 2014;40:179-186. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.06.007
- ⁹⁵ Villanueva K, Badland H, Kvalsvig A, et al. Can the Neighborhood Built Environment Make a Difference in Children's Development? Building the Research Agenda to Create Evidence for Place-Based Children's Policy. *Academic Pediatrics*. 2016;16(1):10-19. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2015.09.006. https://api.research-repository.uwa.edu.au/portalfiles/portal/11513551/Villanueva_et_al_2016_Can_the_Neighborhood_Built_Environment.pdf

- ⁹⁶ Wang Y, Chau CK, Ng WY, Leung TM. A review on the effects of physical built environment attributes on enhancing walking and cycling activity levels within residential neighborhoods. *Cities*. 2016;50:1-15. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2015.08.004
- ⁹⁷ Minh A, Muhajarine N, Janus M, Brownell M, Guhn M. A review of neighborhood effects and early child development: How, where, and for whom, do neighborhoods matter? *Health & Place*. 2017;46:155-174. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2017.04.012
- ⁹⁸ Christian H, Zubrick SR, Foster S, et al. The influence of the neighborhood physical environment on early child health and development: A review and call for research. *Health & Place*. 2015;33:25-36. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2015.01.005
- ⁹⁹ Flouri E, Midouhas E, Joshi H, Sullivan A. Neighbourhood social fragmentation and the mental health of children in poverty. *Health & Place*. 2015;31:138-145. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2014.11.009
- ¹⁰⁰ Walks A. Homeownership, Asset-based Welfare and the Neighbourhood Segregation of Wealth. *Housing Studies*. 2016;31(7):755-784. doi:10.1080/02673037.2015.1132685
- ¹⁰¹ Hou F. Keep Up with the Joneses or Keep on as Their Neighbours: Life Satisfaction and Income in Canadian Urban Neighbourhoods. *J Happiness Stud*. 2014;15(5):1085-1107. doi:10.1007/s10902-013-9465-4
- ¹⁰² Blair A, Gariépy G, Schmitz N. The longitudinal effects of neighbourhood social and material deprivation change on psychological distress in urban, community-dwelling Canadian adults. *Public Health*. 2015;129(7):932-940. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2015.05.011
- ¹⁰³ O'Campo P, Wheaton B, Nisenbaum R, Glazier RH, Dunn JR, Chambers C. The Neighbourhood Effects on Health and Well-being (NEHW) study. *Health & Place*. 2015;31:65-74. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2014.11.001
- ¹⁰⁴ Gariépy G, Blair A, Kestens Y, Schmitz N. Neighbourhood characteristics and 10-year risk of depression in Canadian adults with and without a chronic illness. *Health & Place*. 2014;30:279-286. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2014.10.009
- ¹⁰⁵ Zaami M. "I Fit the Description": Experiences of Social and Spatial Exclusion among Ghanaian Immigrant Youth in the Jane and Finch Neighbourhood of Toronto. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. 2015;47(3):69-89. doi:10.1353/ces.2015.0032
- ¹⁰⁶ Tasan-Kok T. Creating "Spaces for Diversity" from "Spaces of Modernity": The Case of the Jane-Finch Neighbourhood, Toronto (Canada). *AR Arhitektura, raziskave*. 2015;(1):24-33. http://www.fa.uni-lj.si/filelib/9_ar/2015-1/03-tuna-ar2015-1.pdf
- ¹⁰⁷ Bailey N, Besemer K, Bramley G, Livingston M. How Neighbourhood Social Mix Shapes Access to Resources from Social Networks and from Services. *Housing Studies*. 2015;30(2):295-314. doi:10.1080/02673037.2014.1000834. <https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au/bitstream/handle/10072/173118/BaileyPUB311.pdf?sequence=1>
- ¹⁰⁸ Fone D, White J, Farewell D, et al. Effect of neighbourhood deprivation and social cohesion on mental health inequality: a multilevel population-based longitudinal study. *Psychological Medicine*. 2014;44(11):2449-2460. doi:10.1017/S0033291713003255
- ¹⁰⁹ Nieuwenhuis J, Hooimeijer P. The association between neighbourhoods and educational achievement, a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Hous and the Built Environ*. 2016;31(2):321-347. doi:10.1007/s10901-015-9460-7
- ¹¹⁰ Miltenburg EM. The Conditionality of Neighbourhood Effects upon Social Neighbourhood Embeddedness: A Critical Examination of the Resources and Socialisation Mechanisms. *Housing Studies*. 2015;30(2):272-294. doi:10.1080/02673037.2014.995071
- ¹¹¹ Makhoul A, Leviten-Reid E. Determining the value of comprehensive community initiatives. *The Philanthropist*. 2010;23:6.
- ¹¹² Chaskin RJ. Building Community Capacity: A Definitional Framework and Case Studies from a Comprehensive Community Initiative. *Urban Affairs Review*. 2001;36(3):291-323. doi:10.1177/10780870122184876
- ¹¹³ Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC). The Whole Agenda: The Past and Future of Community Development. Published 2002. Accessed July 14, 2020. <https://community-wealth.org/content/whole-agenda-past-and-future-community-development>
- ¹¹⁴ Wiseman J. Local Heroes? Learning from Recent Community Strengthening Initiatives in Victoria. *Aust J Pub Admin*. 2006;65(2):95-107. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8500.2006.00485.x
- ¹¹⁵ Cooper M, Bartlett D. *Strong Neighbourhoods: Building the Foundation for a United Way Neighbourhood Investment Strategy*. United Way of Calgary and Area; 2005.
- ¹¹⁶ Action for Neighbourhood Change. Accessed October 13, 2012. http://www.anccommunity.ca/index_english.html
- ¹¹⁷ Gorman C, Caledon Institute of Social Policy. *Final Reflections from the Action for Neighbourhood Change Research Project*. Caledon Institute of Social Policy; 2007. Accessed July 14, 2020. <https://www.deslibris.ca/ID/206911>
- ¹¹⁸ Gamble J. *Evaluating Vibrant Communities 2002-2010*. Tamarack – An Institute for Community Engagement; 2010. https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/sites/ccednet-rcdec.ca/files/vc_evaluation.pdf
- ¹¹⁹ Gardner B, Lalani N, Plamadeala C. *Comprehensive Community Initiatives: Lessons Learned, Potential and Opportunities Moving Forward*. Tamarack Institute; 2010:33. <https://mconnellfoundation.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Comprehensive-Community-Initiatives.pdf>
- ¹²⁰ City of Toronto. About Neighbourhood Action. Accessed June 12, 2013. <http://www.toronto.ca/nan/about>

- ¹²¹ United Way of Toronto. Building Strong Neighbourhoods: Closing Gaps and Creating Opportunities in Toronto's Inner suburbs. Accessed June 12, 2013. <http://www.unitedwaytoronto.com/downloads/whatwedo/reports/BuildingStrongNeighbourhoods.pdf>
- ¹²² City of Hamilton. Neighbourhood Development Strategy. Accessed April 22, 2013. <http://www.hamilton.ca/ProjectsInitiatives/NeighbourhoodDevelopment>
- ¹²³ City of Hamilton. Hamilton Neighbourhood Action Planning. Accessed April 22, 2013. http://www.hamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/95B062BC-C4CA-496C-A6D3-BCFE8AD6999C/0/NAP_Brochure_Web.pdf
- ¹²⁴ Kubisch A, Auspos P, Brown P, Buck E, Dewar T. Voices from the Field III: Lessons and Challenges for Foundations Based on Two Decades of Community Change Efforts. *Foundation Rev.* 2011;3(1):138-149. doi:10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-11-00010
- ¹²⁵ Cowen D, Parlette V. *Toronto's Inner Suburbs: Investing in Social Infrastructure in Scarborough.*; 2011. Accessed July 15, 2020. <http://3cities.neighbourhoodchange.ca/files/2011/06/Cowen-2011-Social-Infrastructure-in-Scarborough-N-Change.pdf>
- ¹²⁶ Amion Consulting, Department for Communities and Local Government, AMION Consulting. *Evaluation of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal: Final Report: Annexes.* Department for Communities and Local Government; 2010. Accessed July 16, 2020. <https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120919213801/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/14901551.pdf>
- ¹²⁷ Amion Consulting, Department for Communities and Local Government, AMION Consulting. *Evaluation of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal: Final Report: Annexes.* Department for Communities and Local Government; 2010. Accessed July 16, 2020. <https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120919213801/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/14901551.pdf>
- ¹²⁸ Wilkinson K, Whitworth A, McLennan D. Evaluation of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal: improving educational attainment in deprived areas. Accessed July 16, 2020. <https://core.ac.uk/reader/4150660>
- ¹²⁹ Lupton R, Burchardt T, Hills J, Stewart K. *A Framework for Analysing the Effects of Social Policy.*; 2013. <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/spcc/RN001.pdf>
- ¹³⁰ Lupton R. *The Coalition's Social Policy Record: Policy, Spending and Outcomes.* London School of Economics; 2015:69. <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/spcc/RR04.pdf>
- ¹³¹ Hills J, Cunliffe J, Obolenskaya P, Karagiannaki E. *Falling Behind, Getting Ahead: The Changing Structure of Inequality in the UK, 2007-2013.* London School of Economics; 2015:104. <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/spcc/RR05.pdf>
- ¹³² Department of Human Services, Graham M, Taket A. *Neighbourhood Renewal: Evaluation Report 2008.* Government of Victoria, Department of Human Services; 2008. Accessed July 15, 2020. <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30040144>
- ¹³³ Renzaho AMN, Richardson B, Strugnell C. Resident Well-Being, Community Connections, and Neighbourhood Perceptions, Pride, and Opportunities Among Disadvantaged Metropolitan and Regional Communities: Evidence From the Neighbourhood Renewal Project: Community Connections and Resident Well-Being. *J Community Psychol.* 2012;40(7):871-885. doi:10.1002/jcop.21500
- ¹³⁴ Shield M, Graham M, Taket A. Neighbourhood renewal in Victoria, Australia: An effective way to address social inclusion. *Journal of Social Inclusion.* 2011;2(2).
- ¹³⁵ Wood G, Cigdem M. *Cost-Effective Methods for Evaluation of Neighbourhood Renewal Programs.* Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute; 2012:42.
- ¹³⁶ Jalaludin B, Maxwell M, Saddik B, et al. A pre-and-post study of an urban renewal program in a socially disadvantaged neighbourhood in Sydney, Australia. *BMC Public Health.* 2012;12(1):521. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-521
- ¹³⁷ Australian Social Inclusion Board. *Governance Models for Location Based Initiatives.* Dept. of Prime Minister and Cabinet; 2011. Accessed July 16, 2020. <http://www.socialinclusion.gov.au/Resources/Documents/Governancemodelsforlocations.pdf>
- ¹³⁸ Ayón C, Lee CD. Building strong communities: an evaluation of a neighborhood leadership program in a diverse urban area. *J Community Psychol.* 2009;37(8):975-986. doi:10.1002/jcop.20343
- ¹³⁹ Jackson SF. Working with Toronto neighbourhoods toward developing indicators of community capacity. *Health Promotion International.* 2003;18(4):339-350. doi:10.1093/heapro/dag415
- ¹⁴⁰ Goodman RM, Speers MA, Mcleroy K, et al. Identifying and Defining the Dimensions of Community Capacity to Provide a Basis for Measurement. *Health Educ Behav.* 1998;25(3):258-278. doi:10.1177/109019819802500303
- ¹⁴¹ Kretzmann JP, McKnight JL, Neighborhood Innovations Network, Southeast Valley Neighborhood Leadership College, Northwestern University (Evanston Ill), Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research. *Building Communities from the inside out: A Path toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets.* Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University; 1993.
- ¹⁴² Connor JA, Kadel-Taras S. *Community Visions, Community Solutions: Grantmaking for Comprehensive Impact.* Amherst H. Wilder Foundation; 2003.
- ¹⁴³ Davies T. Neighbourhood regeneration: Routes out of disappointment. *Journal of Urban Regeneration & Renewal.* 2009;2(4):337-350.

- ¹⁴⁴ City of Long Beach, Community Development, Neighbourhood Resource Centre. What is the neighbourhood leadership Program? Accessed October 15, 2012. http://www.longbeach.gov/cd/neighborhood_services/nlp
- ¹⁴⁵ *Effective Engagement: A Guide to Principles and Practice - Social Care Online*. Scottish Executive: Effective Interventions Unit; 2002. Accessed September 8, 2020. <https://www.scie-socialcareonline.org.uk/effective-engagement-a-guide-to-principles-and-practice/r/a11G00000017sxEIAQ>
- ¹⁴⁶ Sanigorski AM, Bell AC, Kremer PJ, Cuttler R, Swinburn BA. Reducing unhealthy weight gain in children through community capacity-building: results of a quasi-experimental intervention program, Be Active Eat Well. *Int J Obes*. 2008;32(7):1060-1067. doi:10.1038/ijo.2008.79
- ¹⁴⁷ Savoie J, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada, National Justice Statistics Initiative (Canada). *Neighbourhood Characteristics and the Distribution of Crime, Edmonton, Halifax and Thunder Bay*. Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics; 2008.
- ¹⁴⁸ Andresen M, Savoie J, Bedard F, Collins K. *Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime on the Island of Montréal*. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics; 2006. Accessed July 15, 2020. <https://central.bac-lac.gc.ca/.item?id=85-561-MIE2006007&op=pdf&app=Library>
- ¹⁴⁹ Wallace M, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada. *Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime in Regina*. Statistics Canada; 2006. Accessed July 15, 2020. <https://central.bac-lac.gc.ca/.item?id=85-561-MIE2006008&op=pdf&app=Library>
- ¹⁵⁰ Hipp JR, Perrin A. Nested Loyalties: Local Networks' Effects on Neighbourhood and Community Cohesion. *Urban Studies*. 2006;43(13):2503-2523. doi:10.1080/00420980600970706
- ¹⁵¹ Andresen M, Brantingham P. *Hot Spots of Crime in Vancouver and Their Relationship with Population Characteristics*; 2007.
- ¹⁵² Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW. Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1999;105(3):603-651. doi:10.1086/210356
- ¹⁵³ Sampson RJ. Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy. *Science*. 1997;277(5328):918-924. doi:10.1126/science.277.5328.918
- ¹⁵⁴ Molitor F, Rossi M, Branton L, Field J. Increasing social capital and personal efficacy through small-scale community events. *J Community Psychol*. 2011;39(6):749-754. doi:10.1002/jcop.20452
- ¹⁵⁵ Saldivar-tanaka L, Krasny ME. Culturing community development, neighborhood open space, and civic agriculture: The case of Latino community gardens in New York City. *Agric Hum Values*. 2004;21(4):399-412. doi:10.1007/s10460-003-1248-9
- ¹⁵⁶ Armstrong D. A survey of community gardens in upstate New York: Implications for health promotion and community development. *Health & Place*. 2000;6(4):319-327. doi:10.1016/S1353-8292(00)00013-7
- ¹⁵⁷ Wakefield S, Yeudall F, Taron C, Reynolds J, Skinner A. Growing urban health: Community gardening in South-East Toronto. *Health Promotion International*. 2007;22(2):92-101. doi:10.1093/heapro/dam001
- ¹⁵⁸ Alaimo K, Reischl TM, Allen JO. Community gardening, neighborhood meetings, and social capital. *J Community Psychol*. 2010;38(4):497-514. doi:10.1002/jcop.20378
- ¹⁵⁹ Prezza M, Amici M, Roberti T, Tedeschi G. Sense of Community Referred to the Whole Town: Its Relations with Neighboring, Loneliness, Life Satisfaction, and Area of Residence. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2001;29:29-52. doi:10.1002/1520-6629(200101)29:1<29::AID-JCOP3>3.0.CO;2-C
- ¹⁶⁰ Ohmer ML. Citizen Participation in Neighborhood Organizations and Its Relationship to Volunteers' Self- and Collective Efficacy and Sense of Community. *Social Work Research*. 2007;31(2):109-120. doi:10.1093/swr/31.2.109
- ¹⁶¹ Semenza JC, March TL, Bontempo BD. Community-Initiated Urban Development: An Ecological Intervention. *J Urban Health*. 2007;84(1):8-20. doi:10.1007/s11524-006-9124-8
- ¹⁶² Gilster ME. COMPARING NEIGHBORHOOD-FOCUSED ACTIVISM AND VOLUNTEERISM: PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AND SOCIAL CONNECTEDNESS: Neighborhood Activism. *J Community Psychol*. 2012;40(7):769-784. doi:10.1002/jcop.20528
- ¹⁶³ Gauvin L, Richard L, Kestens Y, et al. Living in a Well-Serviced Urban Area Is Associated With Maintenance of Frequent Walking Among Seniors in the VoisiNuAge Study. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*. 2012;67B(1):76-88. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbr134
- ¹⁶⁴ Ziersch A, Osborne K, Baum F. Local Community Group Participation: Who Participates and What Aspects of Neighbourhood Matter? *Urban Policy and Research*. 2011;29(4):381-399. doi:10.1080/08111146.2011.623295
- ¹⁶⁵ French S, Wood L, Foster SA, Giles-Corti B, Frank L, Learnihan V. Sense of Community and Its Association With the Neighborhood Built Environment. *Environment and Behavior*. 2014;46(6):677-697. doi:10.1177/0013916512469098
- ¹⁶⁶ Wood L, Frank LD, Giles-Corti B. Sense of community and its relationship with walking and neighborhood design. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2010;70(9):1381-1390. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.01.021

- ¹⁶⁷ August M. Social Mix and Canadian Public Housing Redevelopment: Experiences in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*. 2008;17(1):82-100.
- ¹⁶⁸ Arthurson K. Social mix and the city. Challenging the mixed communities consensus in housing and urban planning policies. *J Hous and the Built Environ*. 2014;29(1):185-186. doi:10.1007/s10901-013-9336-7
- ¹⁶⁹ Bolt G, van Kempen R. Introduction Special Issue: Mixing Neighbourhoods: Success or Failure? *Cities*. 2013;35:391-396. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2013.04.006
- ¹⁷⁰ Groenhart LE. Evaluating Tenure Mix Interventions: A Case Study from Sydney, Australia. *Housing Studies*. 2013;28(1):95-115. doi:10.1080/02673037.2013.729268
- ¹⁷¹ Sautkina E, Bond L, Kearns A. Mixed Evidence on Mixed Tenure Effects: Findings from a Systematic Review of UK Studies, 1995–2009. *Housing Studies*. 2012;27(6):748-782. doi:10.1080/02673037.2012.714461
- ¹⁷² Walks A, August M. The Factors Inhibiting Gentrification in Areas with Little Non-market Housing: Policy Lessons from the Toronto Experience. *Urban Studies*. 2008;45(12):2594-2625. doi:10.1177/0042098008097102
- ¹⁷³ Rowe DJ. Investigating The Effects of Tenure Mix In Toronto's Regent Park Community. Published online October 2012. Accessed July 14, 2020. <https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/handle/11375/12626>
- ¹⁷⁴ Classen M. Community Hubs I: An Introduction to the Basics of Community Hubs. United Way of Calgary and Area.
- ¹⁷⁵ *How to Hub: Community Hub Development Toolkit*. Social Planning Toronto; 2019. Accessed September 8, 2020. <https://www.deslibris.ca/ID/10100420>
- ¹⁷⁶ The Canadian CED Network | Strengthening Canada's Communities. Accessed July 20, 2020. <https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/en>
- ¹⁷⁷ *Investing in Canada's Communities: CCEDNet's Policy Framework*. The Canadian CED Network; 2002. https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/files/CCEDNet_Policy_Framework.pdf
- ¹⁷⁸ Northern Star Worker Co-op. Accessed June 18, 2013. <http://www.northernstar.coop/NSOabout.html>
- ¹⁷⁹ The Canadian CED Network. Neechi Foods Co-op Ltd. (Operates Neechi Foods Community Store). Accessed July 14, 2020. https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/sites/ccednet-rcdec.ca/files/ccednet/Profile_-_Neechi_Foods_Cox.pdf
- ¹⁸⁰ Neechi Foods Co-op Ltd. Neechi Commons. Accessed July 14, 2020. <https://neechi.ca/>
- ¹⁸¹ Nye N, Glickman NJ. Working together: Building capacity for community development. *Housing Policy Debate*. 2000;11(1):163-198. doi:10.1080/10511482.2000.9521366
- ¹⁸² Nurture Development. Reports: Proof of Impact. Nurture Development. Accessed April 21, 2020. <https://www.nurturedevelopment.org/reports/>
- ¹⁸³ ABCD Canada. Publications. Accessed April 21, 2020. <https://resources.depaul.edu/abcd-institute/publications/Pages/basic-manual.aspx>
- ¹⁸⁴ Tamarack Institute. Deepening Community | ABCD Resources. Accessed April 21, 2020. http://www.deepeningcommunity.org/abcd_resources
- ¹⁸⁵ Resources. Building Resilient Neighbourhoods. Accessed April 22, 2020. <https://resilientneighbourhoods.ca/resources/>
- ¹⁸⁶ Thompson S, Kent J. Connecting and strengthening communities in places for health and well-being. *Australian Planner*. 2014;51(3):260-271. doi:10.1080/07293682.2013.837832
- ¹⁸⁷ Horak M, Dantico M. The Limits of Local Redistribution: Neighbourhood Regeneration Initiatives in Toronto and Phoenix1. *International Journal of Canadian Studies*. Published online January 1, 2014. doi:10.3138/ijcs.49.135
- ¹⁸⁸ Dulin-Keita A, Clay O, Whittaker S, et al. The influence of HOPE VI neighborhood revitalization on neighborhood-based physical activity: A mixed-methods approach. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2015;139:90-99. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.06.002
- ¹⁸⁹ Vickery J. Community Hubs Initiative. United Way Calgary and Area. Accessed September 9, 2020. <https://calgaryunitedway.org/impact/communities/community-hubs/>
- ¹⁹⁰ Rae R, Jones M, Handal AJ, et al. Healthy Native Community Fellowship: An Indigenous Leadership Program to Enhance Community Wellness. 1. 2016;7(4). doi:10.18584/iipj.2016.7.4.2
- ¹⁹¹ Lending libraries. City of Calgary – Social Programs and Services. Accessed September 9, 2020. <https://www.calgary.ca/csp/cns/strong-neighbourhoods/lending-libraries.html>
- ¹⁹² Tools & Resources | PlanH. Accessed April 22, 2020. <https://planh.ca/resources>
- ¹⁹³ Weisburd D, Davis M, Gill C. Increasing Collective Efficacy and Social Capital at Crime Hot Spots: New Crime Control Tools for Police. *Policing*. 2015;9(3):265-274. doi:10.1093/police/pav019

Community development

- ¹⁹⁴ Tools & Publications | The Canadian CED Network. Accessed April 22, 2020. <https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/page/tools-publications>
- ¹⁹⁵ International Economic Development Council - Publication_Downloads. Accessed April 22, 2020. <https://www.iedconline.org/web-pages/resources-publications/iedc-publications-for-download/>
- ¹⁹⁶ Reference Library. Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership. Accessed April 22, 2020. <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/publication/neighbourhood-research/>
- ¹⁹⁷ Dillman K-N, Horn KM, Verrilli A. The What, Where, and When of Place-Based Housing Policy's Neighborhood Effects. *Housing Policy Debate*. 2017;27(2):282-305. doi:10.1080/10511482.2016.1172103
- ¹⁹⁸ Shroyer A, Schilling J, Poethig EC. Catalyzing Neighborhood Revitalization Through Strengthening Civic Infrastructure. Urban Institute. Published March 27, 2019. Accessed October 27, 2020. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/catalyzing-neighborhood-revitalization-through-strengthening-civic-infrastructure>