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Regent Park is Canada’s oldest and largest social housing project and is currently undergoing a fifteen to twenty year revitalization process. Since the 1940s and 1950s, when Regent Park was first redeveloped from ‘slum’ to social housing project, the neighbourhood garnered a stigmatized reputation for high rates of crime, poor social conditions, and physically isolating infrastructure. In 2005, Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCH) initiated a process of redevelopment in partnership with private developer Daniels Corporation to transform the neighbourhood into a mixed-tenure, mixed-income community. Regent Park will no longer consist entirely of social housing units, instead, the residential make-up will be roughly 70% market rate units and 30% social housing units once the redevelopment is finished. The physical transformation of the neighbourhood is happening alongside coordinated efforts to facilitate the social integration of new and old residents to ensure a cohesive environment for all Regent Park residents.

This social integration component of Regent Park’s revitalization is part of the neighbourhood’s Social Development Plan (SDP) developed by TCH, the City of Toronto, local residents and social service providers. This report proposes a Sustainable Neighbourhood Integration Framework for effectively incorporating the SDP into neighbourhood redevelopment. Themes emerged through an extensive literature review, in-depth interviews with long time residents, a representative of Daniels Corporation, and a number of local social service providers, and a public consultation with residents. These themes inform the framework and include i) Empowerment and capacity building initiatives to support equity within Regent Park, ii) Inclusive programming and facility use, and iii) The necessity of local governance structures that address power differentials. The framework also recommends a neighbourhood-wide communication strategy and the development of a monitoring and evaluation strategy.
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1.1/ INTRODUCTION

Our report documents the work our group has carried out in order to develop a sustainable neighbourhood integration framework for effectively incorporating the SDP into neighbourhood redevelopment.

Regent Park was first redeveloped in the 1940s and 1950s according to modernist principles that aimed to alleviate the area’s ‘slum-like’ reputation for substandard housing and high rates of crime, but it was not long until these issues re-emerged. While planning’s intervention into Regent Park was considered groundbreaking at the time, the pinnacle of innovative social housing redevelopment, today the process to rebuild Canada’s oldest and largest social housing neighbourhood is largely considered a failure that resulted in a stark concentration of poverty, crime, and social exclusion. As Regent Park undergoes revitalization today, there should be heightened awareness that in the years to come there could be regret about decisions made during Regent Park’s redevelopment this time around. We are hopeful that the emphasis on facilitating social development alongside the physical improvements being made to the neighbourhood will be critical to its success. Our client, Toronto Community Housing (TCH), has asked us to create a framework that will be the foundation for the social development aspect of Regent Park’s revitalization. This piece is what sets Regent Park apart from previous redevelopments that have failed to incorporate sustained efforts to facilitate positive social mix and integration as a key facet of redevelopment.

In consultation with community residents, TCH, the City of Toronto, and social service providers created a Social Development Plan (SDP) for Regent Park in 2007. The SDP was created to guide social development and integration throughout Regent Park’s revitalization process and to serve as a long-term strategy for the community. Our report documents the work our group has carried out in order to develop a sustainable neighbourhood integration framework for effectively incorporating the SDP into neighbourhood redevelopment. Our research has been guided by insights from our professional advisor Martine August, a post-doctoral scholar at the University of Toronto whose research focuses on social-mix redevelopment in Toronto. The framework we created proposes local governance
structures and the development of local programs and services, as well as a guide for the use of community facilities. Successful implementation of our framework will require that all components engage both TCH and condominium residents, use strategies that consider historic racisms, class divisions and power imbalances, and provide a plan for its pragmatic implementation. Finally, in order to ensure its continuity, the framework must also identify a monitoring and evaluation strategy that will be used to assess the roll-out of the recommendations.

Regent Park is being transformed into a mixed-income, mixed housing tenure, and mixed-use neighbourhood, with rental buildings, market condominium buildings, townhomes, commercial space, community facilities, active parks, and open space. Formerly, Regent Park was made up entirely of social housing units. Demolition and construction will happen in 5 phases as seen in Figure 2 on page 11.
Regent Park, built in the late 1940’s and early 1950’s in the eastern part of downtown Toronto (see figure 1), is the oldest and most concentrated public housing development in Canada. Originally a ‘slum clearance’ initiative, Regent Park was soon deemed a failure due to decrepit buildings, poorly planned public spaces, and high levels of violence and drug-use. Beginning in 2005, Toronto Community Housing (TCH) began a revitalization process requiring the demolition and rebuilding of the entire community in five phases (see figure 2). TCH brought Daniels Corp. on-board as its developer partner. The end result will be a mixed-income community made up of rent-geared-to-income social housing units, below-market rental units, and privately owned condominiums (TCH, 2007). The project is currently commencing construction phase 3 of 5 (TCH, 2013a).

Investment in not only the bricks-and-mortar reconstruction, but also the social infrastructure, is seen as being a key part of Regent Park’s successful redevelopment. In 2007, Regent Park’s Social Development Plan (SDP) was drafted through a participatory process to engage key stakeholders that included the Regent Park Neighbourhood Initiative, community agencies, the City of Toronto, and residents of Regent Park. The goal of the SDP is to “put in place mechanisms that will focus on achieving greater levels of equity, access, participation, social cohesion and community capacity” (TCH, 2007). The Community Facilities Strategy will support the SDP in providing public space and facilities for programs that serve the new mixed community of Regent Park (City of Toronto, 2005).

Social cohesion between and among the new and existing residents of Regent Park is crucial to the social development of Regent Park. The TCH 2013-2015 Homeward Strategic Plan emphasizes the need to strengthen communities and resident leadership through “working with residents to design and implement an effective way to engage residents in governance, building on the strengths and needs of each community” (TCH, 2013b).
**Figures:**

1. Regent Park situated in eastern downtown Toronto

2. Regent Park site plan after redevelopment
1.3/ METHODOLOGY

The recommendations in this report are derived from the data collected from a combination of secondary and primary research. Secondary research was undertaken in the form of a literature review. The literature review informed the structure of the primary research, which was ultimately conducted through key informant interviews and a community consultation. We consulted our professional advisor, Martine August, in order to identify challenges in facilitating social integration within the context of a socially-mixed, diverse tenure-type housing redevelopment; as a result, our secondary research retained the secondary focus of identifying ways in which challenges might be mitigated or overcome.

Three main thematic areas guided the secondary research. Academic and grey literature were engaged in order to identify community empowerment and capacity building tools; unifying program activities able to transcend cultural, linguistic, and economic barriers; and governance models best able to address power differentials. Examples were pulled from initiatives used in both socially-mixed housing developments, and from other organizational contexts where power imbalances had been considered and addressed.

This information determined the structure and content of the interview questions. The names of eight individuals, willing to participate in the study and closely connected to Regent Park, were provided by Toronto Community Housing. The informants were long-time residents, community social service providers, or a member of Daniels Corporation. The semi-structured interviews, lasting approximately 45 minutes, asked five general questions to all informants as well as a number of questions tailored to the specific experiences or the level of expertise of each interviewee (see appendix B: interview guide).

In order to ascertain the perspectives of a broad range of community members, a public consultation was held following the interview process. This consultation was organized as a community conversation, with residents divided into groups seated at different tables. Each table held at least one facilitator, and one note-taker. TCH recruited participants through community outreach efforts, and provided both the space in which the meeting was held, translation services, volunteers, food and refreshments. Discussions were guided by a series of questions that centered on the identified themes, and concluded with an opportunity for residents to provide feedback or further comment via email or on a comment card.

LIMITATIONS

Resource and time constraints limited the diversity of opinions and perspectives we were
able to hear from the community. While the number of interviews conducted was sufficient for providing critical insight into how revitalization has impacted the community, we recognize that the analysis would be bolstered if additional perspectives from important community members could be incorporated. Additionally, although the community consultation was designed to be inclusive, and reach as many residents as possible, we recognize that the opinions obtained from the process represent only a small sample of the community. It should be noted that in order to achieve a more diversified sample of opinions, multiple community consultations should be carried out in order to account for circumstances, such as work or family obligations, that might mitigate resident participation. It is also recognized that the opinions of residents least likely to engage in consultations would have provided the study with valuable insight.
Despite Regent Park’s stigmatized reputation as a place of concentrated urban poverty and violence, it is important to consider the “benefits and advantages of living in an area of ‘concentrated poverty’” (August, 2014a, p. 1317). August’s research examining the social impacts of TCH revitalizations show that tenants have deep attachments to Regent Park and enjoy a strong sense of community, access to networks of friendship and support, local amenities and convenience, and access to services/agencies that cater to their needs. While August acknowledges that there are serious problems in Regent Park that need to be addressed, such as poor quality housing and maintenance, she questions whether redevelopment that transforms a social housing community into a mixed-income neighbourhood will actually resolve these problems. August also expresses concern that “gentrification-driven ‘revitalization’ might erode the special qualities of place associated with life in Regent Park” (2014a, p. 1318).

August’s research into the experience of social interaction in Toronto’s Don Mount Court community, the first socially mixed public-housing redevelopment site in Canada, revealed that rather than becoming a benevolent site of positive social interaction, what resulted was a very uneven terrain of power dynamics in which middle class residents “with their superior ‘social capital’ and political influence...dominate local decision-making processes” (August 2014b, p. 1163) and “mobilize political influence in ways that are antagonistic to public-housing tenants” (ibid). With the challenges that other mixed-income revitalizations have faced, such as those encountered in the case of Don Mount Court, our goal is to create an equitable framework that reflects the challenges in facilitating social-mix in the revitalization context. The following sections of the literature review focus on practical ways to facilitate community empowerment, effective community programming and activities development, and governance theory and praxis.
COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT

Community empowerment has been widely embraced as an important aspect of community development. However, the term ‘empowerment’ itself is a contested one and has been used in different and often contradictory ways (Mayo and Craig, 1995). On one hand, it can be used to foster collaboration and engagement, challenge existing power relations, redistribute resources, and build capacity (Hurr, 2006; Docherty et al. 2001; Waddington, 2003). Conversely, some forms of empowerment can contain, restrict, and manipulate activism in a regulatory manner (Forrest, 1999; Taylor, 2000). Craig (2002) defines empowerment as “the creation of sustainable structures, processes, and mechanism, over which local communities have an increased degree of control, and from which they have a measurable impact on public and social policies affecting their communities” (p.3).

Community empowerment is an essential component of community revitalization as it enables citizens to influence decisions and outcomes in their local community (McMurray, 2007; Lawson & Kearns, 2009). The outcomes of community empowerment can encompass political, economic, and psychological empowerment at both an individual and collective scale (Maton, 2008). The process and outcomes of community empowerment can vary depending on the community context and lived experience of individuals. In the context of historically marginalized populations, empowerment can encourage oppressed communities to resist, challenge, and change the societal structures and institutions that they exist within (Maton, 2008). Additionally, increased autonomy for marginalized populations can influence local development in a positive way by reducing inequities in the provision of goods and services within the local community (Braithwaite and Lythcott, 1989).

A number of tools can be used to build community empowerment. Christian (1998) found that marginalized Black communities in Liverpool felt empowered through the forging of national networks among other Black organizations to develop and copy “best practices”. Hugh (2003) argues that youth, who are often ignored in community consultation and decision-making must be given opportunities to take a full and active part in decision-making processes within their communities. Cultural mapping has played a role in empowering indigenous communities by preserving cultural knowledge and building community cohesion (Pearce & Louis, 2008). Armstrong (2000) found that community gardens help to improve social networks and organizational
capacity in low-income and minority neighbourhoods. Overall, a number of tools can be used to foster empowerment depending on the community context. What is clear is that increasing the scale and range of empowerment opportunities is critical to enhancing quality of life and equity within communities.

**COMMUNITY PROGRAMMING AND ACTIVITIES DEVELOPMENT**

Sustained programming and activities within neighbourhoods are vital for encouraging social integration between divergent groups. Involvement, cooperation, and empowerment are three key themes to consider when establishing a framework to guide programming and activities that facilitate social-cohesion (Chaskin & Joseph, 2010; Houston, 2012). When done effectively, programming can provide spaces and opportunities for engagement, cooperation, and connection among residents.

Encouraging the involvement of residents in developing, and participating in, community activities will be a key challenge moving forward. There has traditionally been a heavy emphasis on geography when considering integration among residents within mixed-income developments (Fraser, Chaskin, & Bazuin, 2013). Too often it is assumed that social bridging will occur between divergent economic groups based on proximity to one another. Social integration between different socio-economic groups occurs most often when aspects of a shared identity are recognized between individuals (Houston, 2012; Fraser, Chaskin, & Bazuin, 2013). Organizing activities that engage these aspects of identity such as culture, faith, interest, or age specific events, are likely to encourage more substantial integration between residents by offering opportunity for residents to recognize shared identities between one another, and a point of reference for interaction. Activities and spaces for community gardens (Hagney, 2014), cooking programs, poetry and arts groups, walking groups, discounting community outings to museums or art galleries within Chicago’s Lake Park Crescent and Oakwood Shores communities (Metropolan Planning Council, 2006) serve as a few examples of currently employed strategies that transcend economic boundaries to bring together residents holding specific interests, affiliations, and memberships.

Another way to achieve social integration through programming is activities that encourage the collective participation of residents to achieve common goals (Houston, 2012). Manzo and Perkins (2006) have identified that resident attachment to place will create cooperation and participation. Place attachment can occur when shared values, interests, concerns, or histories within a community can be identified (Manzo & Perkins, 2006). Actively bridging the connections between individual identities and community history can foster the creation of a sense of community, and empower residents to participate through the shared emotional connection to place, and shared goals (Manzo and Perkins, 2006; Chinchilla, 2010). Connections between residents can then forge around advocacy or problem-solving that is centered on associations with key issues, concerns, or community goals (Costigan & Quigley, 2006; Manzo and Perkins, 2006). The development of child and youth programming serves as an example of a goal oriented activity that transcends socio-economic boundaries and
engages residents from different backgrounds (Metropolitan Planning Council, 2006; Cytron, 2009; Chinchilla, 2010).

GOVERNANCE THEORY AND PRAXIS

Resident participation in redevelopment decision-making has been accepted as fundamental to project success, however less emphasis has been placed on a governance model that engages all residents in community organizing. Very few models currently exist that govern both subsidized renters and market owners (MIRDG, 2009). Governance requires clear funding sources for outreach and engagement activities, technical assistance, and community building – a structure difficult to implement when confronted with significant power differentials among residents (Fraser, Chaskin and Bazuin, 2013). Even establishing the mechanisms that would theoretically allow for inclusive participation is no guarantee for success – it is critical to “explicitly take into account social difference and unequal access by guaranteeing representation of marginalized social groups” (p. 94). Moreover, unlike free association groups that often arise through grassroots activism, decision-making bodies are necessarily contrived, just like the mixed-income communities that they are situated within (Chaskin, Khare and Joseph, 2012). Fundamental issues in the development of mixed-income governance include: definition and praxis of ‘community’, the role of representatives, and scope of activities.

Community

Residents, of both social housing and market condominiums, may have divergent perspectives of who is included in the ‘community,’ impacting expectations of governance. Seattle’s International District “is not only a geographic unit, but also includes those who no longer live in the district while maintaining personal and collective ties” (Hou and Kinoshita 2007, p. 305). The perception from some members of the community is that those who originated there have the right to determine its current and future identity regardless of current geography. A similar situation may occur with residents relocated, forcibly or willingly, from Regent Park. Who makes up the community of governance?

Communities are not monolithic; even fairly homogenous neighbourhoods differ in terms of aspirations, interests, and priorities (Chaskin
et al., 2012). This contributes to a frustration in understanding when the community, however defined, should “speak with one voice”, and when dissenting opinions are not only allowed but needed (Taylor, 2003, p. 192). This internal heterogeneity is also reflected in capacity levels; there are varying degrees of power within groups of both tenant and market residents. Therefore, not all tenants require capacity building, and it may not only be tenants who could benefit from capacity building.

Governance models must work for both groups in the community. Experience with local governance in the context of social mix redevelopment in Chicago has shown that, despite attempts at diversity, the vast majority of participants were either tenants or market-owners (Chaskin et al., 2012). While crime and safety was the issue that generated the most representative participation, it also created a contentious environment where transgressions of “community standards” were uniformly blamed on public housing tenants. In these situations, tenants may view mixed-income decision-making bodies as “disempowering, ceding authority more powerful others” (ibid, p. 891) and may simply remove themselves from the process. Conversely, if market-owners are frustrated with the governance regime, they have external channels to achieve their aims (ibid). There is a broad ecology of participative bodies of both formal and informal jurisdictions of power that can circumvent the specific community model, resources that market owners are generally better able to exploit (MIRDG, 2009). Therefore, the governance model must balance the interests of those with limited alternative recourse and those with extensive options who must choose to respect its authority.

**Role of Representatives**

The nature of representation in a governance model is a critical consideration. The requirements of operating within a highly sophisticated governance structure can “create a gulf between those who have learned to play the game and those they represent” (Taylor, 2003, p. 193). Communities are not fully engaged if participation is limited to a select few community elites. Representatives are often in a difficult position, required to accurately represent community views, while disseminate and justify decisions back to their community that they may not agree with (ibid). This situation is further complicated when representatives have become employees of the public housing authority, forced to juggle multiple roles and conflicting responsibilities (Chaskin et al., 2012). Institutional players often support the candidacy of community “stars” that are able to quickly operate within the constructs of governance, stymying both representativeness and broader community skill development (Taylor, 2003). Without an emphasis on success planning, leadership vacuums appear when representatives move on.

Issues of representation also appear for market residents. In Chicago, market owners with similar racial and cultural characteristics as subsidized tenants were elevated to positions of power to act as middlemen, able to say and do things that the predominantly white owners would not or would not be able to do (Chaskin et al., 2012). This has created uncomfortable
power dynamics for representatives and their constituents. In cases where membership is tightly proscribed, with specific number of market and tenant representatives, the clear division may serve to reinforce existing differences in the community, and force representatives to take specific positions regarding certain debates (ibid).

**Scope and Role**

A local governance model must have a clearly defined role. If not, the structure can be co-opted at the expense of resident interests, such as government officials using the space as forum of technical information sharing instead of listening to and addressing resident concerns (Chaskin et al., 2012). However, a choice must be made as to whether the scope of discussion will allow for broader issues beyond local micro-politics. With powers limited to control over procedural minutiae, there is a potential for the decoupling of community concerns from the wider socio-political environment, with higher level structural issues never addressed (Taylor, 2003). Moreover, it must be recognized that informal processes are just as critical to achieving a socially harmonious community. Hou and Kinoshita (2007) found that the institutionalized participatory processes in one social-mix redevelopment context frustrated the social integration process by pitting groups as antagonists, while the lack of any structure in a different context encouraged opposing groups to informally work together on communal issues.

For an exploration of sample governance models, please see Appendix C: Governance Models.
2.2/ KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS: DISCUSSION & ANALYSIS

Interviews took place throughout October 2014. Eight interviews were conducted in total, each ranging in time between 45 minutes and 1 hour. The key objective of the interview process was to seek feedback to support the development of a SDP. Questions were structured around three key themes: governance, empowerment and capacity-building tools, and programming and activities. Ten main topics emerged from the interviews, explained below. This is followed by an analysis of the topics according to overall project themes of governance, empowerment and programming.

SECURITY

“Residents are bogged down with matters of basic survival. This leaves little time or opportunity to engage with different residents and issues affecting the community.”

Many interviewees brought up concerns about security. A preoccupation with basic security will hinder proper participation in governance structures, empowerment, and participation in activities. Residents need to feel safe to participate in community activities. Additionally, two interviewees discussed how TCH residents fear that market residents perceive them as a threat to security; this perception hinders resident empowerment and capacity building.

COMMON EXPERIENCE

“If someone wants to engage, they will find ways to engage, but finding things that will bring people out who wouldn’t necessarily come is important.”

A number of interviewees discussed the need to understand commonalities between people in order to build a common identity and vision for Regent Park. This was considered important so that community members can rally behind shared goals and participate in activities centered around commonalities.
“We need to find ways to empower youth; we need to do more than just pull up a chair to the table, we need to give youth the table.”

About half of interviewees saw youth empowerment as vital to the health of the community. Interviewees felt that youth should be represented in governance structures, should feel empowered, and should be given opportunities to take part in programs and activities that build their capacity.

“Accessing information is a problem in Regent Park right now. We need a communication strategy.”

Interviewees unanimously agreed that a better communication strategy was necessary. Many identified the lack of a common space for sharing information as a barrier to involving all community members in programming activities. Three interviewees discussed tensions that have arisen out of misunderstandings between groups. One interviewee highlighted the need for better communication between service providers to allow for cooperation amongst those with common goals.

“Capacity building has always been a priority among social service providers in Regent Park and it should continue to be a priority, not just for TCH tenants but for all residents.”

Building capacity among all Regent Park residents was identified as being key for community members to meaningfully contribute to a governance structure, to feel empowered through education and leadership training, and to organize around the skills already within the community. Additionally, a number of interviewees identified sensitivity training as an important tool to address the power differentials between and within groups.
“There’s the perception among some long-time residents that new facilities such as the aquatic centre aren’t always accessible.”

Minimizing barriers to participation in all forms of community life was seen among many interviewees as crucial for building social cohesion in Regent Park. Organizers should consider all potential barriers including language, physical accessibility, timing, cost, and availability of childcare services. Some residents have said that they have trouble enrolling in classes and programs because non-Regent Park residents now flock to the neighbourhood to use its state of the art facilities, such as the aquatic centre.

“On every level, everyone wants to create that ‘coming together,’ but it’s a hard thing to create – it has to come from the residents [and not just social service providers].”

Creating space and opportunity for the establishment of resident-driven organizations was identified as being important to capacity building, resident empowerment, and social cohesion among community members. The importance of transparency between agencies and residents was also emphasized by interviewees, particularly in regard to the allocation of funds, development of programming, and agency decision-making.

“We’ve had many amazing people come through this neighbourhood who have played significant roles. There are people in this community who have won many awards. We have a history here”.

A number of interviewees discussed the need to understand commonalities between people in order to build a common identity and vision for Regent Park. This was considered important so that community members can rally behind shared goals and participate in activities centered around commonalities.
IDENTITY

“We need to be able to find commonalities – yes people are different, but it is possible to exist together in common space.”

Two concepts were uncovered regarding identity during the interview process. Firstly, about half of interviewees viewed the lack of demographic data available for Regent Park as a barrier for developing programming activities that cater to particular groups. Secondly, the importance of fostering a community wide identity was discussed as a step towards a socially cohesive Regent Park.

EQUITY

“Equity, inclusivity and Regent Park’s history need to be emphasized as the neighbourhood continues to change.”

Interviewees emphasized equity in terms of creating opportunities for low-income groups to participate in programs by offering discounted pricing, empowering marginalized community members, and for marginalized groups to have more weight in decision making and governance structures.
**Figure 3, 4:** Ten main topics analysed according to project theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>UNIVERSAL</th>
<th>GOVERNANCE</th>
<th>EMPOWERMENT</th>
<th>PROGRAMMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Preoccupation with basic security hinders proper governance, empowerment, and participation in activities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The perception that others feel you are a threat to security is disempowering</td>
<td>Safe spaces encourage participation in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TCH residents perceiving concierge as security there to keep them out of buildings</td>
<td>• Seeing people out, walking around, taking part in activities increase feeling of security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Experience</strong></td>
<td>Lack of a common identity and a common vision for Regent Park</td>
<td>Rallying around shared causes and common goals</td>
<td>Without shared experience, hard to encourage interaction among Regent Park residents</td>
<td>Establishing programming activities based on commonalities between people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to understand the commonalities between people</td>
<td>• A common vision about the community to reduce conflicts</td>
<td>• Meaningful empowerment from community as a whole is building towards a goal</td>
<td>• Programs centering around food, arts and culture, sports, youth, shared history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Empowerment</strong></td>
<td>Youth should be represented in the governance structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth must feel empowered in the community</td>
<td>Youth centered programming activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not just tokenize youth but allow them to set agenda and chair meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth mentorships</td>
<td>• Youth bring parents together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities to create, learn, discover, and teach</td>
<td>• Programming to educate youth about rights so they can navigate justice system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Sharing</strong></td>
<td>Regent Park needs a better communication strategy</td>
<td>Misunderstanding between groups</td>
<td>Communication between service providers to build social capital and empowerment</td>
<td>Better understanding of activities happening in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No common space to share information</td>
<td>• share info between community members rather than going to TCH or Daniels</td>
<td>• Work together on shared goals to grow social capacity</td>
<td>• Advertise activities in multiple languages and in multiple locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cannot post all information in market residences</td>
<td>• Eliminating real and perceived tensions</td>
<td>• Services should adapt and to change rather than be designed only to assist a community in perpetual poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transparency about decision making and funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Building</strong></td>
<td>Sensitivity training for all Regent Park Community members</td>
<td>Build capacity to engage in a governance structure</td>
<td>Education, leadership training, sensitivity training etc. to empower residents</td>
<td>Acknowledge existing community expertise builds individual and community capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Power differentials between and within groups</td>
<td>• Important for both TCHC and Condo residents to meaningfully contribute</td>
<td>• Many things exist now because of the voice of residents</td>
<td>• Activities can be organized around community member’s skills and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteering on a committee is a great way to build capacity</td>
<td>• Training programs allow people to equally participate</td>
<td>• Community members as leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment opportunities for community members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>UNIVERSAL</td>
<td>GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>EMPOWERMENT</td>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Minimize barriers to participation:</td>
<td>Governance of shared spaces.</td>
<td>Accessing activities and community meetings empowers</td>
<td>Programming activities must be accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meetings and activities should have clear language, be physically</td>
<td>• Ensure everyone feels comfortable accessing shared spaces</td>
<td>• Cost</td>
<td>• Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accessible, provide childcare and translation, timed appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Various times</td>
<td>• Various times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Acknowledging Regent Park’s legacy</td>
<td>Highlighting Regent Park’s history and recognizing resident achievements</td>
<td>Activities centered around heritage</td>
<td>• Fosters sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Historically disenfranchised</td>
<td>• Proud of history and accomplishments</td>
<td>• Heritage designation</td>
<td>• Heritage designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Driven</td>
<td>Transparent process with community involvement and participation</td>
<td>Resident driven organizations empowers residents</td>
<td>Resident developed and driven programming activities</td>
<td>• Foster culture of learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Get community leaders on board with the governance model</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resident driven organizations empowers residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transparency about decision making and money allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resident driven organizations empowers residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Lack of demographic information hinders ability to make connections across</td>
<td>Although acknowledging different identities is important, distinguishing</td>
<td>Create equitable opportunities for marginalized Regent Park community</td>
<td>Offering programs at discounted price for those who can’t afford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>income levels.</td>
<td>between groups can be damaging</td>
<td>members to have a voice</td>
<td>• Subsidize rental space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Different identities even within ‘market residents’</td>
<td>• Old tenant representatives were mostly men, allow more opportunities</td>
<td>• Hold programming spots for Regent Park members only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Language can be dividing</td>
<td>for women, youth, seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Give more weight to TCHC</td>
<td>Create equitable opportunities for marginalized Regent Park community</td>
<td>Create equitable opportunities for marginalized Regent Park community</td>
<td>Offering programs at discounted price for those who can’t afford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents facilitating meetings rather than agencies</td>
<td>members to have a voice</td>
<td>members to have a voice</td>
<td>• Subsidize rental space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Include residents in development and partnership decisions</td>
<td>• Old tenant representatives were mostly men, allow more opportunities</td>
<td>• Old tenant representatives were mostly men, allow more opportunities</td>
<td>• Hold programming spots for Regent Park members only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TCH must have confidence to feel that their voice is equal</td>
<td>for women, youth, seniors</td>
<td>for women, youth, seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A public consultation was held on November 20th, 2014 at the Regent Park Community Centre. Posters were displayed throughout the Regent Park community prior to the consultation to attract market and TCH tenants as well as community workers. Approximately 65 community members participated in the consultation. Participants included TCH tenants, market residents, and agency workers. The consultation was structured as a community conversation, where we engaged in roundtable discussions informed by our key themes (capacity building, inclusive programming, and governance) to acquire community feedback and opinions. Seven main topics emerged from the consultation, explained below. This is followed by an analysis of the topics according to overall project themes of governance, empowerment (now reframed as ‘capacity building’) and programming.

**COMMUNICATION STRATEGY**

“*Friendship and word-of-mouth is the best way to get people engaged with the community.*”

Most consultation participants brought up the need for a better communication strategy in Regent Park. A community-led communication strategy for sharing ideas and information, building partnerships, connecting people and programs, understanding decisions, and organizing advocacy are essential for building capacity, developing inclusive programming, and creating effective and equitable governance structures.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

“There needs to be a better connection between what we say and ask for and what actually happens.”

Residents felt that their voice should be able to influence change and that local agencies, systems, and governments should be held accountable for involving and listening to resident voices. Further, a number of participants voiced concerns about the loss of services and programs through the revitalization process. Regent Park residents should be informed and included in the conversation about any changes happening in their community.
**SKILL DEVELOPMENT**

“People are very enthusiastic to learn and develop skills and knowledge to help to make solutions a reality.”

Enthusiasm for more leadership and skill development workshops was expressed at the consultation. There is already a huge skill-set among community members and future programming should be developed around this to encourage community led organization. Specific focus should be on developing programming directed at increasing the capacity of youth and community members interested in participating in governance structures.

**ACCESSIBILITY**

“Many groups in Regent Park may have barriers to accessing programs due to cultural differences in how they receive information.”

Ensuring equitable access to programming and governance models is essential for empowering community members. Consultation participants addressed a number of current barriers to participation in community life that included: long waiting lists, lack of women-only hours, language, financial costs, registration process, etc. Residents expressed that resources are often limited and should be reserved for Regent Park residents first.

**DIVERSITY**

“Regent Park is a model of diversity; Canada and Toronto can benefit from the diversity of knowledge and opinions – you shouldn’t need to speak English in order to participate.”

Regent Park is an incredibly diverse community, this diversity must be respected and represented in programming, decision-making, and everyday community life. Community members felt that activities should consider and respect cultural differences by advertising and administrating activities in multiple languages. In governance models, different perspectives from cultural backgrounds and income groups must be represented and respected.
“Decision-making needs to be 50/50, we’re really smart here even if we don’t have a lot of money, we are capable of making decisions but need some power to do that.”

Equity should be at the forefront of future programming and governance models. Historically disenfranchised community members should be given voice in decision-making and reserved space in programming activities. Most consultation participants felt that decision-making should be left to Regent Park residents, and that outside voices can be considered only if they are elected by the residents and have something important to contribute.

“Us residents know the most about what is happening on the ground right now in Regent Park”.

Regent Park residents have the strongest sense of local knowledge. Programming can be developed around this knowledge and residents should be hired to work on projects in the community to increase the skillset and knowledge within the community. Additionally, community members felt that they knew the most about the community and should be given decision-making autonomy.
**Figure 5:** Seven main topics analysed according to project theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>CAPACITY BUILDING</th>
<th>PROGRAMMING</th>
<th>GOVERNANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Strategy</td>
<td>Community led communication for sharing ideas and information</td>
<td>Better communication to connect with people and programs</td>
<td>Better communication to increase decision making knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• building partnerships between neighbours, buildings and service providers</td>
<td>• hard to reach market residents, especially renters: allow posters in condo buildings</td>
<td>• ensure all Regent Park community members understand decisions being made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• build resident advocacy</td>
<td>• RP wide news source that is accessible for all</td>
<td>• develop strategy for communicating concerns from residents with language barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sharing information about jobs, skills, and programming opportunities</td>
<td>• Youth programming brings people out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Confidence that your voice can influence change</td>
<td>Community spaces should sustain revitalization</td>
<td>Accountable decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• understanding agencies, systems, local governments and your rights as a Regent Park resident</td>
<td>• community groups have lost space, need to ensure that space will be available for meetings</td>
<td>• those who are the ones directly affected should be the ones making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure resident voices are being heard and taken seriously</td>
<td>and programming</td>
<td>• decisions must be an ongoing conversation, not one-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Skill Development</td>
<td>Develop local skill-sets to develop local programming</td>
<td>Use existing Regent Park Skill-set to develop local programming</td>
<td>• people who have their roots in RP and are directly involved with the community can influence decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• develop skills to aid in solving community concerns</td>
<td>• RP community members have a range of skills they can teach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• skill workshops geared towards getting RP community members jobs</td>
<td>• service providers should help facilitate the development of clubs and programs so community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• focus on youth (ex. apprenticeship programs)</td>
<td>members can share existing skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Everyone should be able to access tools and learning opportunities</td>
<td>Programming should be accessible to all RN residents</td>
<td>Removing barriers to participation in governance structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• resources should not be for one group, everyone should be able to access (ex. computer rooms are for seniors only)</td>
<td>• resources and programs are limited with long waiting lists, they should be made accessible to RP residents first</td>
<td>• translation available to express concerns and questions from people whose 1st language is not English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feeling safe is a pre-requisite for participating in capacity building activities</td>
<td>• women’s only hours and programs</td>
<td>• information sessions informing residents on all current decisions being made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>All resident voices must be heard</td>
<td>Programming should respect and consider diverse communities</td>
<td>Diversity must be represented within governance model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure resident voices are listened to with respect and acceptance</td>
<td>• ground rules and sensitivity training for respecting cultural differences</td>
<td>• different perspectives from different cultural backgrounds and income groups need to be represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• programming must be advertised in different languages</td>
<td>• translation available because language is a huge barrier to participating in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• womens-only programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Give louder voice to those who have been historically disenfranchised</td>
<td>Save allocated programming space for youth and historically disenfranchised residents</td>
<td>Equitable decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ideas must be respected before building capacity of individuals and groups</td>
<td>• RP residents unable to sign up for programs because of long waiting lists</td>
<td>• give voice to historically disenfranchised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• RP youth are unable to obtain space in programming (ex. music program)</td>
<td>• decision-making body should be representative across income and cultural divides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representatives of agencies and government organizations should be elected by residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Knowledge</td>
<td>Build on and utilize local knowledge</td>
<td>Programs should be developed around resident knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Decision-making should be left to Regent Park residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• employ residents (youth in particular) in construction of new buildings</td>
<td>• Regent Park residents have a range of skills and knowledge about the community, programming and activities should reflect this</td>
<td>• residents know the most about Regent Park and are impacted the most, therefore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initiate a community benefits agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>decision-making should be left to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• community members can select workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Insights gained from our literature review, key-informant interviews, and the community consultation informed our recommendations listed in the sustainable social integration framework. This framework represents a significant and hopeful addition to mixed-income planning interventions. It demonstrates TCH’s commitment to redevelopment having positive social impacts along side the physical reconstruction of Regent Park.
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3.1/ INTRODUCTION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This sustainable neighbourhood integration framework should guide the incorporation of the Social Development Plan (SDP) into the Regent Park redevelopment process. It provides tangible ways to build social cohesion by facilitating meaningful neighbourhood integration and community building. This framework will propose local governance structures and the development of local programs and services, as well as guide the use of community facilities. Successful implementation of this framework will require that all components engage both TCH and condominium residents, use strategies that consider historic racisms, class divisions, and power imbalances, and provide a plan for its pragmatic implementation. Finally, in order to ensure its continuity, the framework also identifies a monitoring and evaluation strategy that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the framework in facilitating neighbourhood cohesion in Regent Park.

CONTEXT

This framework is the product of collaborative work between TCH and the University of Toronto. Five urban planning graduate students, under the direction of TCH staff, conducted the research and analysis that informed this framework as part of the Master’s of Science in Planning Program requirements.

DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The framework is the product of an extensive secondary literature review, semi-structured interviews with eight service providers that work in various capacities in Regent Park, and a community consultation with approximately 65 residents from the neighbourhood.
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Historic, economic, and social marginalization of the Regent Park community has disadvantaged some of the long-term residents. Revitalization without social development has the potential to create or exacerbate existing racial and class divisions between groups of residents in the community based on economic status, cultural affiliation, capacity, and tenure type. Five guiding principles were adopted to inform the social integration framework. These guiding principles address power imbalances and historic disadvantage by encouraging understanding of disparities, disadvantages, and barriers to access, and address ways to overcome these obstacles by ensuring transparency and fairness in process, in order to increase participation, and facilitate social cohesion within the community. These principles are: equity, empowerment, participation, inclusion, and diversity.

Recognizing the legacy of marginalization, disenfranchisement, and exclusion, this framework will promote the values of respect and reciprocity by:

**Working towards equity within Regent Park by recognizing the historic and continued disenfranchisement and marginalization of social housing tenants. The fact of inequity informs all aspects of this framework and its recommended actions.**

**Empowering the community through its commitment to support and encourage capacity building.**
Supporting participation through enhancing local democracy, and ensuring opportunity for community members to engage in local decision-making and collaboration.

Considering factors that enhance inclusion and ensure community members feel welcomed, respected, supported, and valued.

Proactively engaging a diversity of community members by considering different needs, and interests.
Community programming and effective facility management provides an important focal point for developing social cohesion by creating opportunity for interaction between different resident groups. Activities, however, should not be developed and implemented within a silo, but should maintain their intended purpose of community development and social cohesion by working with other social service providers within the community to achieve these goals.

Suggestions by service providers and residents of Regent Park have been incorporated into this analysis and have been used to inform recommendations for the implementation of the framework. The next section will offer an examination of these results focusing first on general considerations for both facility management and use, and the development of programming and events. This will be discussed within the context of the themes that emerged from interview process and the key components of cooperation, participation, and empowerment identified within the literature review.
SECURITY

During the interview process, the mention of safety and security was a prominent issue raised by most key informants as a factor that discourages participation in community events and activities. This is consistent with studies that have examined perceptions of safety within neighbourhood environments, and the willingness of parents to allow children to engage in public spaces (Carver, Timperio, & Crawford, 2008). One respondent indicated that the presence of children is an indicator of safety: “one of the things that improves my sense of safety is the visibility of young people.”

As a result, addressing security and the perception of insecurity within the community is paramount. This should be addressed not only as a means to encourage individual participation in events and activities, but to reduce distrust between community members. While addressing criminal activity within the area extends beyond the scope of this report, it is recommended that community members be included in planning for safety. This offers both the opportunity to empower residents by giving them some control over their environment, and provides an opportunity for cooperative action between community members, serving as a means to bridge existing divisions and reduce distrust. According to one interviewee, past community meetings seeking to address instances of violence within the neighbourhood have been well attended by both TCH residents and market residents. Edmonton, Alberta’s Neighbourhood Empowerment Team Program developed an initiative to tackle community disempowerment as a result of crime, and may offer an example for developing a similar program in Regent Park (Pauls, 2005).

RECOMMENDATION 1: ESTABLISH A COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP

Establish a community working-group involving both TCH and market residents, and community partners such as police, businesses, and social service members. The working group would focus on addressing security and perceptions of security within the community through identify who is using facilities and in what capacity. Identify community groups least likely to engage, and confirm through surveys or alternative means, the factors limiting their engagement.
ACCESSIBILITY

The issue of accessibility was identified as an important consideration for event and activity development, as well as for developing policy regarding community facility management. Access issues that were raised pertained to both physical and social elements of accessibility. Residents that were interviewed identified misperception among community residents over their ability to access and use community facilities. Furthermore, socio-economic circumstances were identified as potential constraints for residents, inhibiting their capacity to engage in the use of community facilities as well as in community activities. These constraints include, but are not limited to the timing of programs, events, and facility hours of operation, types of programming (for example, women only hours), financial cost, language of programming, proximity to childcare, understanding of program requirements and availability, and awareness of activities, and registration processes. The additional concern over non-Regent Park residents dominating use of community facilities was also identified.

In order to address the issue of equitable facility use, it is important that facility operators understand who is using community facilities and in what capacity. This will enable a better understanding of how existing policies might be modified to ensure more equitable access. The existence of current programming should be more actively communicated to residents to increase awareness of them and how to participate in them. This might include providing promotional material and other related information in multiple languages, and through a medium that is accessible to all community members. Finally, it is recommended that both facility and community programming modify current practices to consider issues of equity. For example, providing discounted rates to low income households, reserved spaces or free childcare for Regent Park residents when attending community programs, or using community facilities.

RECOMMENDATION 2: UNDERSTAND WHO IS AND IS NOT USING FACILITIES AND WHY

Identify who is using facilities and in what capacity. Identify community groups least likely to engage, and confirm through surveys or alternative means, the factors limiting their engagement.

RECOMMENDATION 3: MODIFY PROGRAMS

Based on previously identified barriers to access, modify facility and programming in order to consider equity, such as hours of availability, cost, availability of childcare, and registration processes.
EVENTS & ACTIVITY DEVELOPMENT

Identifying commonalities between residents offers a starting point for the development of events and activities. Almost all key informants recognized the need to identify common interests and associations in order to centre event and activity programming around these interests as a means of fostering interaction between residents of differing backgrounds. Examples of this include activities with food and agriculture, art and culture, sports and activity programming, and youth programming. This type of activity development becomes integral for social cohesion as interest-focused activities can engage residents in a way that negates economic circumstance when programming is designed to consider equity. In particular, youth focused programming occurring within underutilized community spaces provides the unique opportunity to engage residents and encourage facility use. It also introduces parents and other community members to spaces not normally frequented through support of their children’s participation in events and activities.

Additionally, identifying commonalities between service providers can allow for collaboration towards shared goals, resulting in more effective and empowering programming. In order to develop programs that are guided by these interests, it is important that activity and event planners understand community interests. Therefore, it is recommended that before proceeding with the development of new programming, both TCH residents and market residents should be surveyed in order to identify common interests between residents. Additionally, increased communication between service providers will allow for services and activities to be better adapted for the changing community. Finally, where possible, events and activities should be facilitated by community members in order to utilize community resources and existing skillsets, guided by the aforementioned accessibility considerations, and effectively communicated to the community. This would provide opportunities for empowerment, skill development, and participation. For this to occur, community resources and resident skill-sets will need to be identified in order for them to be utilized.

**RECOMMENDATION 4: IDENTIFY COMMUNITY INTERESTS AND SKILL-SETS**

Identify community interests and individual skill-sets that might serve as resources for the development of community events and programming. Identify common goals among community service providers to encourage collaboration among and between organizations.

**RECOMMENDATION 5: UTILIZE EXISTING COMMUNITY RESOURCES**

Existing community resources and skillsets should be utilized in the development of events and activities to allow for resident leadership and to foster a culture of resident led clubs and activities. Additional focus should be given to the development of youth focused programming that utilizes existing community spaces.
3.3.1/ GUIDE FOR INCLUSIVE PROGRAMMING AND FACILITY USE

ENHANCE UNDERSTANDING OF ISSUES AFFECTING FACILITY USE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMMING:

1. Community interest and composition study:
   - Compile information regarding community members.
   - Identify key interests and commonalities that transcend socio-economic barriers and revolve around food and agriculture, arts and culture, or sports and physical activity.

2. Community resource identification:
   - Identify community members that might volunteer as community leaders
   - Identify community members that would be willing to donate their time to programming and event planning.

3. Identify guidelines for programming that considers the historic marginalization of Regent Park residents:
   - Understand how community facilities are currently used
   - Identify barriers to access for groups underutilizing public spaces.
3.4/ LOCAL GOVERNANCE

WHO IS REGENCY PARK?

Uncertainty about the characteristics and interests of both market and TCH residents hinders not only the ability to create representative governance, services, or programming, but also successful outreach strategies to spur initial engagement. Anecdotally, market residents have been described as middle class, owners, renters, new Canadians, young professionals, queer couples, and socially minded individuals – certainly not a homogenous group. Moreover, despite perceptions of uniform middle-class homeownership, many residents of the market building are likely renters, with associated levels of income and social precariousness. Specific numbers are currently unknown. While some interviewees presume that market owners (and renters) are relatively informed about the social environment in Regent Park, others are skeptical that the information has been properly communicated through the purchasing process.

Likewise, while there is a higher percentage of live-in ownership than in most condominium developments, residents who come to the community through the secondary rental market may not have the same understanding of their role and positionality in Regent Park. Market residents, from the perspective of an interested third party, are much more difficult to access than the TCH residents who can be reached through a single landlord. However, this does not negate the need for a deeper understanding of TCH residents as well. With many residents leaving the community through the redevelopment process, (some never to return), needs and interests have likely changed since the last survey completed years ago.

RECOMMENDATION 6: LEARN THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF REGENCY PARK

As the Regent Park community continues to develop, as new buildings are constructed, the balance of residents will also continue to change, requiring further investigation on the part of governance bodies and social service providers to better address their needs, desires and concerns. A demographic analysis cannot be a one-time process.

SHARED ASPIRATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

A community visioning process will bring Regent Park residents together to understand and contextualize their differences, but also learn and develop commonalities and shared aspirations.
Community consultations must be widespread and inclusive, with particular emphasis placed on sharing the history of place. This is also a time to speak frankly about social differences, including different forms of power and access to resources between and within different groups of residents. Youth involvement, on a level equal to that of adults, is critical to create a vision that speaks to the future. Such a process, to best position the community to develop and sustain a governance model, must address:

- **Definition of community** – A complicated and initially contentious discussion that connects understandings of people and place, residents must be encouraged to share their feelings about the question: “what is Regent Park?” and: “who is Regent Park?” Similarly, it is important to air opinions about who is not included in conceptions of Regent Park and why. Though likely a painful and tense conversation, bringing suppressed emotions to surface is critical for long-term stability. This topic is at the root of most conflicts in the neighbourhood, and needs to be confronted at the outset.

- **Vision of neighbourhood** – While the physical visioning of Regent Park has been extensively discussed, debated, and modified, the psycho-emotional sense of community involving both market and TCH residents has not. What do residents aspire for in their neighbourhood? A place where all are welcomed? A place that is supportive of different experiences and challenges? A place where everyone is equally valued for different contributions? While this process itself will generate a sense of cohesion and shared aspirations amongst different residents, it is also necessary as a baseline for future decision-making. Having implications for how issues should be addressed, the vision can be referenced as the ideal to work towards. Currently, the only time the community comes together is after a crisis, momentum that is not sustained. Common goals can create cohesion that is more than reactionary.

- **Scope of model** – Residents must decide amongst themselves what is the scope of the governance model. What are boundaries of issues to be discussed? What powers should be invested in the structure? A choice will inform the model’s objectives and activities it pursued. There is a spectrum of possibilities, with three likely delineations explained in Figure 6 (on the following page).
INFORMATION SHARING

ROLE: PRIMARY CONDUIT FOR INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

This model would invite communication from TCH, market developers, and external actors to residents of Regent Park, on topics such as redevelopment progress, local initiatives, or political activities. Similarly, residents would reciprocate by raising issues that matter to them in their community. For the purposes of social integration, this model would work to address the misconceptions of different groups in the neighbourhood. There is a common perception that all condominium residents are upwardly mobile, high-income individuals, but this is not always the case. Similarly, there is a misperception that the concierge service in the market buildings is a security system designed specifically to keep the TCH tenants out. On the other side, there are multiple misconceptions about the experience of TCH tenants, as well as attribution of social nuisances to particular groups. There is a need to eliminate not only the real conflicts, but perceived conflicts too.

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE

ROLE: CENTRAL HUB FOR ISSUE RESOLUTION AND ACTIVITY COORDINATION

A respected and clear model for rule-setting and dispute resolution can create a harmonious environment for all community members, with frustration channeled productively instead of spilling over into situations of social mixing. Governance could address space provision, coordinate volunteers for events and activities, and create issue-specific organizations, committees and events for the benefit of the community. It could develop relationships with service providers, social clubs, and civic and advocacy groups within Regent Park to mutually strengthen each others missions. Governance in this typology should particularly address the conflicts over shared community resources. Longstanding Regent Park residents feel as though the de-stigmatization of the community has the unintended effect of making the wider Toronto community feel entitled to use neighbourhood social spaces, limiting access for locals.

EXTERNAL REPRESENTATION

ROLE: EXTERNAL ADVOCACY AND DECISION-MAKING

In addition to the previous activities, the governance model could be used by Regent Park to represent its voice on a larger city-wide platform. Relationships would be developed with councilors, MPPs, MPs, city staff, city-wide stakeholder groups and advocacy organization. The community could use the model as a basis for collective organization to take political stances on pertinent issues, ensuring Regent Park participation in development projects, planning processes and citywide activism.
RECOMMENDATION 7: BEGIN PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS WITH REGENT PARK TO CREATE A BASELINE VISION OF THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

Community consultations will allow for the formation of governance model that will continue to resonate with residents into the future. As with a demographic analysis, conversations should continue as the community changes and adjusts its priorities. At the same time, new visions should build upon, not cast aside, prior visions.

RECOMMENDATION 8: LET COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP DRIVE THE PROCESS

While institutional actors may be involved in initiating the governance development process, there are many on the ground in the community that have the same vision. Avoid the development of parallel, competing models by reaching out early and bringing all individuals together under one tent.

INCLUSION OF LOCAL LEADERSHIP

Despite the disruptions caused by revitalization, experienced and passionate leadership in the local community. Getting community leaders, both established and emerging, on board early will ensure broader public acceptance and participation in governance. Leaders should not only be in support, but should provide a platform for them to drive and shape the model. A core group of active residents from both market and TCH accommodation should act as ambassadors to engage their networks. In addition, these individuals could begin the process of cohesion and integration by inviting each other to their group meetings, sharing information and helping develop personal bonds that will sustain the future governance model.
3.5/ RECOMMENDATION 9:
REGENT PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION

Governance in Regent Park would be well served by a version of a neighbourhood association, modified to suit the particular composition and needs of the community. A formalized structure, procedure and rules would be drawn up in the association’s bylaws, modeled after similar neighbourhood associations and condominium boards.

3.5.1 PRINCIPLES

EQUITY

The neighbourhood association must ensure fairness to all residents, with each participant feeling they have been heard. With large variances in ability and experience, this may require procedures, which are admittedly not equal, but that achieve an equitable outcome. There are times when new residents may have valuable contributions of innovative ideas from elsewhere, and other times where historical impacts can only be communicated by long-time residents of Regent Park. It is necessary to ensure that TCH tenants do not become disenchanted and disengage; at the same time, the model must ensure that market residents view the process as legitimate and do not withdraw to alternative channels. This emphasis on equity could be established by an explicit acknowledgement of the legacy of Regent Park, including historic events and experiences of disenfranchisement, while avoiding the attachment of specific qualities to current residents nor alienating new community members.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Clear lines of accountability will ensure that actions will be taken.

RESPECT FOR EXISTING GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

The model is not an attempt to remove power from current governance structures, but rather establish an overall coordinating body to multiply the power of individualized efforts. The association will work with and support current and future systems in place within TCH and market buildings.

MEASURING PROGRESS

What is working and what is not? How has community adjusted? What can be done differently in the future? The community should govern to achieve specific results that push towards their vision for Regent Park.

FLEXIBILITY

The neighbourhood association model must be able to adapt to changing circumstances as the composition of the community and relevant issues change over time.
A history of mistrust amongst long-time Regent Park residents has provoked a community consciousness that is highly attuned to perceived bias or improprieties. Moreover, TCH and market residents will both initially assume that this association will cause their ‘group’ to lose power and resources. Clarity of process and outcome is critical for continued support by the community it purports to serve.

The neighbourhood association must balance open participation, where all residents are able to contribute, and the necessary practicality of using representatives to make decisions. This balance can be facilitated through the provision of volunteer opportunities on committees, which simultaneously builds residents’ latent leadership capacity. The association should acknowledge the presence of diverse identities in the community, while not defining individuals by those identities. It requires the recognition that no Regent Park resident is the same, whether from market or TCH housing, and inclusionary language and practices that respect the different constituents. Constituting upwards of 36% of the community, youth under 25 must also have a defined position at the table; they are a critical aspect of the future of Regent Park, especially for integration internally and with the broader community. Not to be tokenized, youth can help create agendas and lead discussions. Inclusionary participation means that all residents have an equal opportunity to participate, regardless of age, gender, education, racialization, status and income. Of particular note is its importance within the TCH and market constituencies, where women with less education have been previously been sidelined.
3.5.2 STRUCTURE

The governance structure will be modeled after a typical neighbourhood association (as seen in Figure 5) with necessary modifications. Each building or building cluster (subject to definition) will nominate and elect an allotted number of delegates to the General Assembly. This may be done through existing structure (such as Tenant Council or Condominium Board) so long as all residents, and only residents, are allowed to vote (this means that market renters are allowed to vote, while owners who do not also live in the building as their primary residence are not). The General Assembly will elect, from amongst themselves, a Board of Directors. The Board must have an equal number of TCH and market building Directors. Therefore, the system operates much like the bicameral system of the United States – the lower house (General Assembly) with delegates elected somewhat proportionally to population, while the upper house (Board of Directors) with delegates elected in equal numbers regardless of population.

The neighbourhood association will have both standing and ad hoc committees. Standing (permanent) committees will be formed for enduring issues and realms of activity. Examples could include: Events Committee, New Resident Committee, or Safety Committee. Ad hoc (temporary) committees will formed as needed when issues arise. Examples could include: Pool Allocation Committee, Snow Clearance Committee, or Summer Festival Committee. Committees will be populated by a Board member (chair), delegates, and residents. If within the scope of association, the Board will appoint interested delegates to external participatory associations in the broader community that address issues that affect Regent Park residents. Examples could include: BIAs, issue-based working groups, neighbourhood association alliances, and poverty alleviation networks.
Figure 7: Proposed governance structure
3.5.3 REPRESENTATION

It is important to have a set number of delegates for each constituency, TCH and market residents. First, the association could otherwise have extraordinarily skewed representation depending on voter turnout. Second, this reduces the importance of voting eligibility. In other words, the determination of whether a vote is allocated to every unit, adult, or resident is no longer as critical to ensuring equitable representation. The unfortunate outcome of a prescribed representation is that delegates are implicitly encouraged to represent their constituency (of TCH or market) instead of looking out for the community as a whole. The presence of voting blocks can be minimized, to some extent, by having delegates represent a building instead of a tenure type.

Understanding the importance of giving each group an equitable voice, the allocation of representation acknowledges the importance of increasing the weight of TCH residents to a level greater than their proportion of the population would otherwise dictate. Resident delegate allocation is as follows, based upon building or block of buildings (depending on number of units). This is only an estimate – this must change as building sizes for later phases of redevelopment are finalized.

- 1 delegate for block with 50 units or less
- 2 delegates for block with 51–100 units
- 3 delegates for block with 101–200 units
- 4 delegates for block with more than 250

Since the majority of TCH buildings are smaller in size, and blocks with larger numbers of units (over 100) have relatively less voting power than those with fewer units, this should positively affect the degree of influence for TCH residents (to be determined and adjusted based upon final Regent Park site plan confirmation).

All delegates must reside in Regent Park community as their primary residence. Therefore, the owner of rental unit who does not also live in Regent Park cannot be a delegate. The General Assembly and Board will feature limited terms to encourage turnover and widespread engagement and leadership development, preventing reliance on one individual for needs to be met.

At the discretion of the Board of Directors, associate membership is available for organizations or businesses located in Regent Park based on group’s mandate and activities being consistent with the association. Associate members get one representative at General Assembly meetings, able to speak on issues, but not propose motions or vote. Potential associate members include TCH, Daniels, service organizations, representatives from other governance organizations, and political figures.

Youth age 15–24 will have their own representation. Specific number of delegates to be determined based on updated demographic information for neighbourhood. A youth delegate is no different from a regular delegate, with the same privileges and responsibilities.

Initially, there will not be mandatory representation by different groups. However if representation is not relatively proportionate to composition of community (particularly a voice for TCH affordable renters, or market renters), additional parameters may be implemented to require a certain level of participation by underrepresented groups.
3.5.4 LOGISTICS

MEETINGS

Meetings will be held in a variety of buildings to ensure that all residents feel included. Moreover, the process may help residents become comfortable and familiar with spaces where they may not currently feel welcomed. Locations include: TCH buildings, market buildings, and service hubs and social spaces.

Board meetings will be held monthly, General Assembly meetings at least bi-monthly, and committee meetings when required (determined by committee). The Annual General Meeting, held yearly, will allow all residents of Regent Park the opportunity to vote on particular issues.

RELATIONSHIPS

Matters concerning individual buildings should be decided by those affected, and not open for association vote. It is critical to allow residents sense of control over own environment and make independent choices.

ROLE OF OFFICIALS

The neighbourhood association is a forum for residents, by residents. Although initiated from the top-down, it must operate as independently as possible. While the required funding may be provided by external organization (such as TCH), once it is allocated it must not be tampered with. If money is to be provided as a small stipend for delegates, it must be filtered through the association and not directly from TCH. This buffer will limit conflict of interest and co-optation, whether real or perceived.

FUNDING

The neighbourhood association requires a sustainable, long-term funding source for outreach and engagement, community building activities, and technical assistance. Social integration is not a project that can be completed in months or even a few years, as there are decades of antipathy, misunderstanding, and resource deprivation are not easily overcome. Funding needs to be granted to the association to decide how to use, with appropriate oversight. The organization will mature if it is forced to take responsibility for proper accounting practice.

ENGAGEMENT

The sustained existence of a neighbourhood association requires continued engagement with the community in order for there to be enough support and participation to maintain the association. Engagement should primarily be, resident driven but should also be facilitated by community social service providers and TCH.

CAPACITY BUILDING

Residents need knowledge and a skill-set that will allow them to fully participate and take on leadership roles in order for a neighbourhood association to be successful.
3.6/ COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

There needs to be an effective communication strategy in place within Regent Park to ensure that all residents, despite their cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, have access to information about programming, activities, faculty use, and decision making that is occurring throughout the community. Analysis of our interviews and public consultation has made it clear that information sharing through flyers is not adequate to reach all cultural groups and creates a large barrier to social cohesion and resident engagement. Therefore a variety of communication tools need to be used by TCH and other service providers to ensure that all residents are given the opportunity to participate in community activities. An effective communication strategy will work to increase the capacity and empowerment of Regent Park residents to have a voice within their neighbourhood, and also work to create social cohesion and a strengthened sense of community through the increased engagement of all residents.

RECOMMENDATION 10: A CENTRAL REGENT PARK NEWS SOURCE NEEDS TO BE CREATED THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT ISSUES OF ACCESSIBILITY, LITERACY, CULTURAL, AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIFFERENCES.

- A community-focused newsletter should be developed and made available to all residents, in a variety of languages that informs of all activities and programs occurring throughout Regent Park.
- This newsletter should also be made available online. Information sharing and crowdsourcing (such as employment opportunities) through social media should also be encouraged among youth of Regent Park.
- Investment should be made in a Regent Park radio, television, or YouTube channel in order to engage with groups of residents that may have barriers to receiving information by mail or online.
- Volunteer engagement positions should be created for each resident building. These volunteers will be responsible for informing residents about programs, activities, and decisions being made throughout the community by word of mouth. There should be funding allocated for a full time resident engagement coordinator.

RECOMMENDATION 11: MECHANISMS SHOULD BE CREATED THAT FACILITATE MORE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN TENANT AND MARKET RESIDENT GROUPS

- TCH should work with the property manager for the market condominiums to allow information flyers to be posted in the lobby to inform residents about programs, activities, and decision making that is occurring in Regent Park.
- A listserv should be created for any Regent Park residents who wish to gain information about activities electronically. Residents, rather than social service providers, should monitor this listserv.
In order to ensure that continuing social cohesion is occurring throughout and after the completion of the Regent Park revitalization, we recommend that a steering committee comprised of service providers within the community be created to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of this framework. This committee should be comprised of representatives from the City of Toronto, Social Planning Toronto, Daniels Corporation, and TCH. Led by TCH, it will be the job of this committee to evaluate the success of the framework through qualitative analysis. These stakeholders will also be responsible to encourage service providers working within the Regent Park community to integrate the goals of meaningful community engagement and social cohesion into their organizations’ mandates and to incorporate the above recommendations into their governance models, their use of public space and facilities, and the development of new programming.

Specific indicators used to evaluate the effectiveness of this framework should be identified and agreed upon by the steering committee prior to the establishment of this framework by Regent Park service providers. These indicators should be community based, realistic, and should be established before the social integration framework is implemented. As this framework deals with a social development project, the single use of traditional quantitative evaluation approaches will be inadequate to assess the effectiveness of the sustainable social integration framework.

Because of this, data for evaluation should be acquired using long-answer questionnaires distributed to all social service providers working in Regent Park and an equal sample of both TCH tenants and market residents. These questionnaires should attempt to understand if a greater sense of community is being created in Regent Park, if residents are accessing the public spaces and programs, and if residents feel like they have a meaningful voice in community decisions. Although TCH should primarily be responsible for the distribution and collection of questionnaires, the steering community should participate in the monitoring and evaluation process as well as participate in deciding how to proceed to ensure the sustainable social integration framework fulfills its mandate.
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LUSION
Research investigating the social outcomes of mixed-income redevelopments has demonstrated that social mixing is unlikely to occur on its own.

This framework is representative of a significant and hopeful addition to mixed-income planning interventions. The recommendations presented throughout our sustainable social integration framework were informed by our literature review, key-informant interviews, and a community consultation. It demonstrates TCH’s commitment to the redevelopment of Regent Park resulting in tangible and positive social impacts.

Research investigating the social outcomes of mixed-income redevelopments has demonstrated that social mixing is unlikely to occur on its own. De-concentrating pockets of poverty by introducing middle-income housing types to a neighbourhood that was previously occupied solely by social housing does not by itself mean that people with different socio-economic backgrounds will form a strong and inclusive sense of community. It is far more likely that these different groups of residents will form parallel communities that co-exist uneasily.

As mentioned previously, social mix redevelopments, such as Don Mount Court, resulted in frequent tensions and power dynamics between different groups of residents instead of becoming spaces of positive social intervention (August, 2014). Steps need to be taken to ensure conditions are created so that positive social integration can occur. This requires purposefully empowering and building the capacity of local residents and organizations, fostering an environment of inclusive activity programming and facility use, and working with the community to ensure that meaningful and equitable governance mechanisms are in place.

Despite our optimism of and confidence in the social integration framework, we understand that social cohesion cannot simply be shaped by these recommendations. Specifically, purposely empowering local residents will involve more than ensuring activities, programs, and decision making mechanisms are
inclusive. Although this is a start, it was highlighted throughout our interviews and public consultation that more employment opportunities need to be made for youth in the community. Although this is outside the scope of our recommendations, creating meaningful opportunities for youth will empower the community as a whole and steps by all stakeholders involved in Regent Park should be taken to ensure this occurs. Further, social integration between different socio-economic groups occurs most often when aspects of a shared identity are recognized between individuals (Houston, 2012; Fraser, Chaskin, & Bazuin, 2013). Only when community members have similar interests, will social cohesion truly begin to take place.

Throughout our interviews it was suggested that uncertainty, ignorance, and distrust among residents stems from xenophobia. To challenge these historical social distrusts and strengthen social cohesion, it is realistic to think that along with fostering an inclusive environment, the goals of the SDP will take time. Despite these limitations, we are hopeful that our recommendations and an emphasis on facilitating social development and infrastructure along side physical improvement will be crucial to the success of this social mix redevelopment.
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APPENDIX A: ABRIDGED FRAMEWORK

Executive Summary

This is an abridged version of the sustainable neighbourhood integration framework. It provides tangible ways to build social cohesion and should be used in tandem with the longer, more robust framework. This framework proposes local governance structures and the development of local programs and services, as well as a guide the use of community facilities. Successful implementation of this framework will require that all components engage both TCH and condominium residents, use strategies that consider historic racisms, class divisions, and power imbalances, and provide a plan for its pragmatic implementation. Finally, in order to ensure its continuity, the framework also identifies a monitoring and evaluation strategy that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the framework in facilitating neighbourhood cohesion in Regent Park.

Framework Context

This framework is the product of collaborative work between TCH and the University of Toronto. Five urban planning graduate students, under the direction of TCH staff, conducted the research and analysis that informed this framework as part of the Master's of Science in Planning Program requirements.

Framework Development Process

The framework is the product of an extensive secondary literature review, semi-structured interviews with eight service providers that work in various capacities in Regent Park, and a community consultation with approximately 100 residents from the neighbourhood.

Abridged Framework Contents

1. Guiding Principles
2. Inclusive Programming and Facility Use: Key Messages & Recommendations
   2.1 Guide for Inclusive Programming and Facility Use
3. Local Governance: Key Messages and Recommendations
4. Model for Local Governance: RP Neighbourhood Association
   4.1 Principles
   4.2 Structure
   4.3 Representation
   4.4 Logistics
5. Communication Strategy
6. Monitoring & Evaluation


   a) Guaranteeing equity through recognition of difference, and seeks to provide fair treatment by ensuring access, opportunity, and advancement opportunities for community members.
b) **Empowering** the community through its commitment to support and encourage capacity building.

c) Supporting **participation** through enhancing local democracy, and ensuring opportunity for community members to engage in local decision-making and collaboration.

d) Considering factors that enhance **inclusion** and ensure community members feel welcomed, respected, supported, and valued.

e) Proactively engaging a **diversity** of community members by considering different needs, and interests.

2. Inclusive Programming & Facility Use: Key Messages & Recommendations

**Security:**

**Recommendation 1: Establish a community working group**

Establish a community working group involving both TCH and market residents, and community partners such as police, businesses, and social service members. The working group would retain the focus of addressing security and perceptions of security within the community through the development of programs and activities with a specific focus of increasing community safety. The program would exist to both empower community members and address both actual and perceived security within the neighbourhood.

**Accessibility:**

**Recommendation 2: Understand who is and is not using facilities and why**

Identify who is using facilities and in what capacity. Identify community groups least likely to engage, and confirm through surveys or alternative means, the factors limiting their engagement.

**Recommendation 3: Modify Existing Structures**

Based on previously identified barriers to access, modify facility and programming in order to consider equity, such as hours of availability, cost, availability of childcare, and registration processes.

**Events and Activity Development:**

**Recommendation 4: Identify community interests and skill-sets**

Identify community interests and individual skill-sets that might serve as resources for the development of community events and programming. Identify common goals among community service providers to encourage collaboration among and between organizations.

**Recommendation 5: Utilize existing community resources**
Existing community resources and skillsets should be utilized in the development of events and activities to allow for resident leadership and to foster a culture of resident-led clubs and activities. Additional focus should be given to the development of youth-focused programming that utilizes existing community spaces.

2.1 Guide for Inclusive Programming and Facility Use

Enhance understanding of issues affecting facility use and community programming

a. Community interest and composition study:
   i. Compile information regarding community members. Identify key interests and commonalities that transcend socio-economic barriers and revolve around food and agriculture, arts and culture, or sports and physical activity.

b. Community resource identification:
   i. Identify community members that might volunteer as community leaders
   ii. Identify community members that would be willing to donate their time to programming and event planning.

c. Identify guidelines for programming that considers the historic marginalization of Regent Park residents:
   i. Understand how community facilities are currently used
   ii. Identify barriers to access for groups underutilizing public spaces.

Address actual and perceived security and safety concerns:

d. Develop safety and security programming in partnership with police.

3. Local Governance: Key Messages and Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Learn the demographic profile of Regent Park

Uncertainty about the characteristics and interests of both market and TCH residents stymies not only the ability to create representative governance, services, or programming, but also successful outreach strategies to spur initial engagement.

Recommendation 2: Begin public a consultation process with Regent Park to create a baseline vision of the past, present, and future of the neighbourhood

A community visioning process will bring Regent Park residents together to understand and contextualize their differences, but also learn and develop commonalities and shared aspirations. Community consultations must be widespread and inclusive, with particular emphasis placed on sharing the history of place.
**Recommendation 3: Let community leadership drive the process**

Despite the disruptions caused by revitalization, leadership in the local community is well established. Getting community leaders on board early will ensure broader public acceptance and participation in governance.

**4. Model for Local Governance: Regent Park Neighbourhood Association**

4.1 *Considerations:*

Equity; Transparency; Inclusive Participation; Flexibility; Build on and respect existing governance structures; Measuring Progress; Accountability

4.2 *Structure*

The governance structure will be modeled after a typical neighbourhood association (as seen in Figure 4) with necessary modifications.
4.3 Representation

It is important to have a set number of delegates for each constituency, TCH and market residents. First, the association could otherwise have extraordinarily skewed representation depending on voter turnout. Second, this reduces the importance of voting eligibility. In other words, the determination of whether a vote is allocated to every unit, adult, or resident is no longer as critical to ensuring equitable representation.

4.4 Logistics

Meetings

Meetings will be held in a variety of buildings to ensure that all residents feel included.
Board meetings will be held monthly, General Assembly meetings at least bi-monthly, and committee meetings when required (determined by committee). The Annual General Meeting, held yearly, will allow all residents of Regent Park the opportunity to vote on particular issues.

**Relationships**

Matters concerning individual buildings should be decided by those affected, and not open for association vote. It is critical to allow residents sense of control over own environment and make independent choices.

**Role of officials**

The neighbourhood association is a forum for residents, by residents. Although initiated from the top-down, it must operate as independently as possible.

**Funding**

The neighbourhood association requires a sustainable, long-term funding source for outreach and engagement, community building activities, and technical assistance.

**Engagement**

The sustained existence of a neighbourhood association requires continued engagement with the community in order for there to be enough support and participation to maintain the association. Engagement should primarily be grassroots, resident driven but should also be facilitated by community social service providers and TCH.

**Capacity building**

Residents need knowledge and a skill-set that will allow them to participate robustly and take on leadership roles in order for a neighbourhood association to be successful.

5. **Communication Strategy: Key Messages and Recommendations**

There needs to be an effective communication strategy in place within Regent Park to ensure that all residents, despite their cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, have access to information about programming, activities, faculty use, and decision making that is occurring throughout the community.

**Recommendation 1**: A central Regent Park news source needs to be created that takes into account issues of accessibility, literacy, cultural, and socio-economic differences. This news source should include a variety of ways to share information.

- A community-focused newsletter should be developed and made available to all residents, in a variety of languages that informs of all activities and programs occurring throughout Regent Park.
• This newsletter should also be made available online. Information sharing and crowdsourcing (such as employment opportunities) through social media should also be encouraged among youth of Regent Park.

• Investment should be made in a Regent Park radio, television, or YouTube channel in order to engage with groups of residents that may have barriers to receiving information by mail or online.

• Volunteer engagement positions should be created for each resident building. These volunteers will be responsible for informing residents about programs, activities, and decisions being made throughout the community by word of mouth. There should be funding allocated for a full time resident engagement coordinator.

**Recommendation 2:** Mechanisms should be created that facilitate more communication between tenant and market resident groups.

• TCH should work with the property manager for the market condominiums to allow information flyers to be posted in the lobby to inform residents about programs, activities, and decision making that is occurring in Regent Park.

• A listserv should be created for any Regent Park residents who wish to gain information about activities electronically. Residents, rather than social service providers, should monitor this listserv.

6. **Monitoring and Evaluation**

In order to ensure that continuing social cohesion is occurring throughout and after the completion of the Regent Park revitalization, we recommend that a steering committee comprised of service providers within the community be created to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of this framework. This committee should be comprised of representatives from the City of Toronto, Social Planning Toronto, Daniels Corporation, and TCH. Led by TCH, it will be the job of this committee to evaluate the success of the framework through qualitative analysis. These stakeholders will also be responsible to encourage service providers working within the Regent Park community to integrate the goals of meaningful community engagement and social cohesion into their organizations’ mandates.
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Sustainable Neighbourhood Integration in Regent Park Interview Questions

Foundation Questions/Identification/Context

1. We know that you (Interviewee Position/Occupation/Role), but how would you describe your role in Regent Park? Which groups do you primarily engage with (eg. tenancy type etc.)?

2. What do you think is working well right now with the Regent Park revitalization (in terms of social integration)? What do you think could be improved?

3. What are the current and foreseeable concerns regarding social mix throughout Regent Park?
   
   A) Daniels: Do you think that market residents feel that they are a part of the regent park community?
   
   B) In what situations does tension exist between market and TCH tenants?

4. Have there been times/instances during which both market and TCH tenants have participated in a community event/meeting/activity. What got both groups out?
## Appendix C: Governance Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Constituents</th>
<th>Governance Structure</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative housing</td>
<td>Generally mixed income – combination of subsidized RGI and market housing (ratio different for each) in one housing building</td>
<td>Board of Directors (BoD) that determines bylaws, budget, etc. Committees are formed to deal with particular issues.</td>
<td>Membership elects the BoD at Annual General Meeting (AGM), entirely composed of co-op members. Some co-ops require certain time commitment on committees.</td>
<td>According to CMHC, no real difference between participation rates of market and RGI tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community land trust (CLT)</td>
<td>CLT homeowners, public interest organizations, broader (local) community</td>
<td>BoD elected through majority voting based on different CLT membership categories. 1/3 elected by CLT property owners, 1/3 by community members, and 1/3 are public officials (to uphold broader public interest). Some CLTs mandate that 1/3 of the BoD (representing any of the above categories) must represent “low-income people”. Attempts for consensus prior to majority voting.</td>
<td>Two membership categories: 1) People who live or own property on CLT land; and 2) anyone from the community with an interest in the CLT (that pays a small annual membership fee). Community membership can be limited to a specific geographic area, or CLT may view “community” as a fluid concept and that identification with the community is the more important criteria.</td>
<td>CLTs attempt to balance the interest of individual property owners with the interests of the broader community. Not isolated to one particular site, but spread out throughout a neighbourhood, the actions have implications for a large group of people. Additionally, with mandates for achieving community development (more than solely housing provision) they require broad base of support and interest. CLT organizers emphasize a number of considerations for organizational structure: time commitments (if too rigorous, eliminate a lot of people from potential participation); decision-making structure (detailed procedures may predict issues and provide checks and balances – though if too complicated, people will get frustrated, or ignore the rules and improvise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint health and safety committees</td>
<td>Workers and management in a specific place of employment – work together to highlight and address health and safety issues in the workplace</td>
<td>Committee with at least half of membership being (non-managerial) workers (in unionized environment, must be part of the union). Two co-chairs, one management and one worker, who alternate chairing every meeting. Hold regular meetings structured by strict agenda so business won’t be side-tracked. Quorum requires representation from both sides.</td>
<td>Workers in workplace vote to choose worker representatives. Employer chooses representatives from amongst management. Members of the committee are paid, as it is considered part of their work.</td>
<td>Key practice of the committee is to write recommendations for employer to implement. Legally enforceable practice (by Ontario Ministry of Labour). Clear emphasis that employers have added responsibility – codified in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium governance</td>
<td>Condominium owners (members of specific condominium corporation) and sometimes renters</td>
<td>BoD elected by and composed of condo owners (though renters could theoretically be elected, though do not get a vote). Minimum three people. Majority voting. If payment to condo board in arrears, cannot vote. If over 15% of the units of the corporation are considered “owner-occupied,” no person other than an owner of owner-occupied unit may elect or remove someone from the board.</td>
<td>Some condominium corporations allow one vote per unit; others weight the vote based on ownership of common elements. In the latter, the weighted vote is calculated by taking the proportion of the unit value in relation to the value of entire building (so those with more valuable units have a larger voting weight). The rationale is that the value of the nit determines the amount paid in condo fees, therefore those who pay a larger share get more of a say in operations.</td>
<td>BoD creates bylaws and rules. Bylaws dictate how the corporation is run – fees, elections, decision-making format. Rules dictate the day-today practices in the condo; pets, noise, parking, appearance of unit, use of shared amenities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CONCLUSION**

1. **Participation**
   - Key practice of the committee is to write recommendations for employer to implement. Legally enforceable practice (by Ontario Ministry of Labour). Clear emphasis that employers have added responsibility – codified in law
   - **Must** assist committee members
   - **Must** provide information
   - **Must** consult with committee on development of any program within purview
   - **Legal** offense for employer to frustrate the system
   - **Must** respond to written recommendations within 21 days, must explain why ignoring recommendations, or provide timeline for action