



Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop
May 8, 2015

Workshop Report

Sheila Beauchemin
ADVISOR + FACILITATOR + COMMUNICATOR + CPF

P: 250.381.7907 C: 250.213.1989
521 Northcott Avenue, Victoria, BC Canada V9A 2V5
Sheila@SheilaBeauchemin.ca Twitter.com/S_Beauchemin
www.SheilaBeauchemin.ca

Table of Contents

Session Overview, Purpose and Objectives	3
Summary Results	3
Equity Planning Concepts and Practical Realities – Presentations	5
Exploring the Practical Realities of Applying an Equity Lens to Planning	6
Equity Planning In Action - Working with the Toolkit	11
Considering Next Steps.....	15
Appendix 1 – Presenter Biographies.....	20
Appendix 2 – Planning Scenarios	22

Session Overview, Purpose and Objectives

Island Health and the CRD are developing frameworks to introduce health and social equity considerations into local government planning activities. The promotion of health and social equity is the process of enabling people and communities to increase ownership and control over their own health and well-being, as well as influencing the conditions necessary for good health and resilience to economic, environmental and social distress.

Health and well-being transcend boundaries. For public responses to be effective they must be highly coordinated across jurisdictions, sectors, disciplines and organizations. As a result, the CRD and Island Health brought together a broad range of participants from across the region for a one-day workshop to discuss the application of equity planning concepts; and, to evaluate a proposed equity planning toolkit.

The main objectives of the workshop were to:

- Establish a shared understanding of the relationship between health and social equity and local government planning;
- Identify the barriers planners might face in applying equity principles to everyday planning activities;
- Provide specific direction for the further development of an equity lens toolkit; and
- Strengthen community partnerships critical to planning for healthy public policies and planning practices.

A total of thirty-five participants attended the workshop at the Songhees Wellness Centre. The organizations represented were welcomed to the Coast Salish Territory, and the traditional lands of the Songhees First Nation, by Mr. Butch Dick and included: Island Health; City of Victoria; District of Saanich; District of Central Saanich; Town of Sidney; Township of Esquimalt; District of Highlands; Victoria Native Friendship Centre; Songhees Nation; Capital Regional District; Capital Region Housing Corporation; Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development; Gorge Tillicum Community Association; Success by Six; and the Greater Victoria Coalition to End Homelessness.

Summary Results

The workshop was divided into three parts – the morning was spent gaining a shared understanding of equity concepts and discussing how these concepts align with the reality of planning within the region. The afternoon shifted the focus from concepts to practice and involved the application of a draft equity toolkit to real life planning scenarios. To conclude the day, a series of questions were identified and discussed to map out some possible next steps in the development and implementation of an equity toolkit for use in day-to-day planning activities.

This document captures the results of the workshop and the specific input provided by participants about the toolkit. Through each of the three activities, the following four broad themes or conclusions emerged:

1. Adding equity considerations to planning activities is a long-term endeavour that will require additional work for planners and a sustained commitment from politicians. Finding senior level champions, at the political level, will be critical if equity objectives are to be incorporated into planning in a real and meaningful way.

Capital Regional District/Island Health Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

2. Broad based participation that includes those most vulnerable in our society must be achieved. Incentives to ensure that engagement is inclusive and that all voices heard will be necessary.
3. Research and data that supports the benefits of incorporating equity into planning is needed – there are currently gaps in the business case needed to gain support for this initiative.
4. Increased knowledge, education and understanding about equity issues are required. There is a general lack of understanding about equity issues in our community. The development of a common language that explains equity issues in simple terms to gain support, understanding, empathy and commitment would help address this.

The need for collaboration across organizations and jurisdictions to work on these themes was also recognized. The workshop itself was viewed as a great first step in establishing the networks and connections needed to continue the conversation around equity planning within the region.



Workshop participants engage in an impromptu networking session during an un-planned fire drill

Capital Regional District/Island Health Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

them in meaningful ways will be critical to advance the development of an equity lens for use in the community.

- Bill Brown from the Township of Esquimalt shared the practical realities of local government planning.



He noted that equity is just one of several lens that planners must consider when reviewing development applications. Planners must consider if a development: is constitutional and legal; is fair and just; has impacts on neighbours, communities, transportation infrastructure; is in a hazardous area; has accountability and governance structures; is designed appropriately; has economic or taxation implications. After all of these considerations have been addressed, then equity principles can be

applied.

He shared some of the challenges that have been faced in getting projects with equity objectives approved such as providing relief from minimum parking requirements for an affordable housing project and the Esquimalt Village Living Building project.

The biographies of the presenters are included in Appendix 1.

Exploring the Practical Realities of Applying an Equity Lens to Planning

The presentations provided the background context for a series of group discussions about the practical application of equity planning concepts to day-to-day planning activities. Groups were asked to discuss the following questions:

1. How did the examples of equity planning in action align with your reality?
2. What do you see as the major benefits of applying a health and social equity lens to day-to day planning activities?
3. What challenges might be faced when applying equity principles to everyday planning activities?



The main insights gathered from each table generated a series of key considerations, benefits and challenges that will inform the on-going development and implementation of tools to include health and social equity issues in planning decisions. These considerations are listed under each of the questions in the tables below.

Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015



How did the examples of equity planning in action align with your reality?

Nature of Equity Issues

- Displacement from housing – how can amenities be provided without equity gentrification?
- Support vs. Nimbyism...shouldn't we be over that? But it's ongoing...build support with each project
- Culture & Language – acknowledge that there is privilege and inequality within the community
- Complete communities – not just all the services/resources – also needs an equity lens with respect to who can live there
- Higher density/more resources = less affordable; fewer amenities is to often where affordable housing is located
- Cost of poverty/health care
- Hard realities = poverty is underpinning many equity issues

Planning process and procedure

- How do we bridge the rural-urban divide?
- Integrate environment into planning – where are low income neighbourhoods?
- Some areas (e.g. early childhood development) don't have much if any planning
- We need to see more examples (urban & rural) of equity planning in action
- Use of equity principles and design in planning activities varies significantly between projects (e.g. resources, time, individual leadership)
- Equity lenses resonate with government – procedure, distribution, structural, trans-generational

Level of understanding of equity principles

- Requirement for planners to participate in cultural competency training
- True principles of equity not followed
- Lack of understanding of what equity is
- Discrimination limits equity

**Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015**

Commitment to a long-term effort

- Inconsistencies/sustainability to keep the momentum and the trust
- Population outcomes take a long time
- Good process takes time
- Not taking a long term view in planning – focus is on current issues and quick wins
- Long view becomes challenging. How do we sustain conversations?

Engagement - Identification of who needs to be engaged

- Need for consistent, regular and genuine engagement with First Nations – recognition of constitutional right
- No participation by person's with lived experience
- Grassroots agitation creates movement to equity
- Need formal process to ensure all voices are heard
- Community vs. individual responsibility
- We need to acknowledge and recognize who is and who is not showing up to the conversation
- Need more grassroots based definition of the problem and development of solutions
- Engagement and participation of those with lived experience is important but not happening

Engagement - Understanding of how to engage a broad range of groups

- Lack of mention/inclusion of public engagement
- Communities (e.g. immigrant communities) and past 'clubs' of enclaves now may be a virtual or online network connecting members
- Definition of Neighbourhood: physical vs. online: In the past town hall – illustrates a safe place for diverse opinions. Physical social interaction reinforced a level of respect. Online versions lack that – lead to galvanized less inclusive attitudes.
- Need to present information at a literacy level that is accessible for all
- System currently supports some segments and those will continue to be more and more engaged but others are overlooked...not brought into interacting with or benefiting from system
- How do we amplify vulnerable voices?
- Understanding and communications within communities – not just "engagement" when it is convenient

Silos, mandates & authority

- Disconnect between the scale of the problems and the authority required to deal with them at a local level
- Separation of responsibilities – silos = someone else is doing equity therefore it is not happening across the board
- People working within mandates but need to broaden the perspective

Strong knowledge transfer needed to get action

- Knowledge transfer of equity benefits to political decision makers
- Translating this in a way that people can understand
- Translating knowledge into action on difficult issues
- Need to focus on all levels e.g. not just homelessness

What do you see as the major benefits of applying a health and social equity lens to day-to-day planning activities?

Improved use of Resources

- Decreased costs in reactive services i.e. policing, acute care
- Efficient and effective use of resources
- Land use property and tax focus shifted to social and community resources
- Homelessness exists because of a dysfunctional system – housing is underused. Could be improved by taxation; incentives to using housing; rising interest rates.

Positive Social Impacts

- Positive benefit to current and future generations
- Social Impact
- Improved services (better bike routes, public transportation)
- Social Impact Assessment (alongside environmental impacts)
- Social impact investment vs return on investment – how do you measure this?
- Equity planning in transportation ensures improvements for all (not political)

Inclusive and Open Planning Processes

- Equity lens allows us to be mindful of support/resources to effect inclusive planning i.e. childcare language, transportation
- Staff will be exposed to different perspectives
- Helps us recognize need to be inclusive, thoughtful to needs of affordability, access, transportation (equal value to society)
- Puts into perspective the competing interests of different groups
- Build an “equity checklist” (as part of the OCP and as part of development permits)
- Will help planners get out of “planning speak”

Increased participation from diverse voices

- Facilitate participation by marginalized communities
- Ensure early engagement in process by diverse groups to mitigate conflict
- Encouraging input, engagement increases trust leading to more uptake in services
- Better capture of the expertise of those people who will use services
- Helps increase public awareness re: equity
- Targeted outreach strategies/community input

Sharing Between Organizations

- Opportunity for information sharing; collective approach to targets, outcomes, and measuring effectiveness.
- Potential to dissolve silos between agencies and organizations
- Forces us to look at the big picture (collective impact)
- Holistic approach – less silos

Capital Regional District/Island Health Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

Resilient Communities

- Resilient system – i.e. transportation, housing – so that diversity is able to withstand shock
- Challenges us to be more nimble and flexible in planning

What challenges might be faced when applying equity principles to everyday planning activities?

Engagement

- Consultation fatigue
- Planning MOUs slow and people get fatigued and step away from the process
- Finding and engaging with those folks who should be engaged in the discussion
- Language around equity can be problematic in that it is only accessible to some
- Lack of aboriginal involvement with municipal planning (legislation)
- Overcome token consultation with the loudest voices

Institutional norms, culture and processes impede progress

- Large institutions and professions are slow to change
- Overcoming ‘mandates’
- Institutional risk/adverse to change
- Capacity building – wade through levels of jurisdiction
- Different personalities guide various processes – some work more effectively than other/have to be fair
- Tyranny of the urgent
- Politics – big “P” and little “p”
- Requires enlightenment at the top of the organization
- Size of organization – small departments provide greater opportunities
- Do you have the authority to “colour outside the lines”?
- Local/regional government levels suited to do equity planning but may not have resources/support from senior government
- Don’t walk the talk – planning is political
- “Not our mandate” – appearance of “not our role/job”

Lack of knowledge about equity

- Knowledge transfer or sharing capacity a challenge. It is not easy to educate/discuss/compromise with all due to differences in basic understanding
- Need local success stories – where has an equity lens been successfully applied? Need leaders!
- Not understanding what equity is
- What are the benefits to “them” – self interest

Data Gaps

- Consistency in indicators/measurement – how can we best use the data for applying the equity lens?
- Access to disaggregated data – poor census data etc.

Capital Regional District/Island Health Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

Denial

- Bigotry – lack of tolerance, compassion
- Systems can be set up to serve certain groups and not others. There is a lack of understanding of the situation of certain groups.
- Denial of equity problem
- NIMBY – can be based on discrimination, racism etc.
- NIMBYism exists at many levels and prevents equity issues from being addressed
- Lack of empowerment – people feel disadvantaged by the system leading to a lack of trust; lack of access to services/resources etc; tension between different perspectives of land use

Lack of Resources and clear business case

- Funding is all 'earmarked' – how can we shift thinking re: core services?
- Lack of financial and human resources especially in smaller municipalities
- Cost/benefit may not be understood by the community
- Understanding the value of the investment in equity – there is a benefit but the cost can be high to engage
- Claims that it may cost more to incorporate equity in planning process
- Lack of resources for formal and informal training and development

Creating a safe space for difficult conversations

- Acknowledging the tough stuff
- Move at the speed of the people
- Expanding the conversation – diversity in the room – this is a challenge and an opportunity
- Messaging - knowledge translation of the equity lens, outcomes and benefits
- Challenges = opportunity
- Emotional readiness – are we ready to receive/act upon information?
- Lack of trust or disbelief that action/change will follow
- Facilitating a safe space/environment, circumstances and language to have an open discussion on equity – need to build the trust to engage

Equity Planning In Action - Working with the Toolkit

The afternoon session focused on the application of a draft equity toolkit to real life planning scenarios. Participants worked with one of seven scenarios developed from the equity planning issues submitted in advance of the workshop (the scenarios explored are included in Appendix 2). Following an exercise that applied the equity toolkit to one of the scenarios, participants provided specific input about the workability of the toolkit and suggested ideas for improvement.

What was it like to apply the toolkit to the scenarios?

- In order to apply the equity toolkit, communities need:
 - Mandate/legislative requirement to address social and equity issues in planning i.e. like Bill 27 – required targets, policies to be included in OCPs, RGSS

Capital Regional District/Island Health Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

- Resources – capacity building, financial and human resources to implement
- Data – who can collect data and disseminate consistent and comprehensive up to date data?
- Didn't have enough time [to work through the scenario and matrix]
- Not all stakeholder groups are relevant to all topics
- Some of the rows and columns [in the matrix] didn't mesh
- Zoning can address income and disability and seniors? Legally?
- Highlighted limitations of zoning authority to address equity toolkit – other mechanisms [may be] more appropriate
- Good way to ensure we haven't missed anything and good for reporting back to groups
- Tough but interesting tool
- Some confusion working through each step – needed more clarity on intention of each step, especially Step 1.2 and Step 2
- Hard to identify changes to the toolkit until it has been used a few times.
- Easier to apply toolkit to more concrete examples (i.e. rec centre) rather than an entire OCP review

How would the application of the toolkit make the planning process easier/harder?

- What are the risks to planners if they miss a stakeholder need – and it comes back on them?
- More complex process
- Can make it easier because agencies and stakeholders can take on the actions and responsibilities – collaboration and partnerships
- Scope of engagement process would be broadened = time and money
- Engagement of stakeholders was a valuable category but the list of stakeholders is limited and would need to be revisited on a case by case basis
- Allows us to think systematically. It is a helpful guidance document that can be applied consistently.
- If equity was a 'stakeholder' it would help to compress/contain engagement process (an equity advisory committee similar to heritage or sustainability committees)
- Would help to have an equity planner on staff with authority and leadership
- Planners can not do it alone

Capital Regional District/Island Health Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

- Will make projects more thorough – help build case [for equity]
- Can the neighbourhood environment be a stakeholder? Lists of examples
- More time consuming. Need to look at it very early on to ensure enough time.

What specific issues came up?

- More information needed – need more data and therefore more partnerships to apply this
- We weren't sure how specific we should be with engagement
- Is the toolkit only for affected marginalized groups or for all stakeholders?
- Need for an over-riding vision/framework to guide planning decisions (already consulted with stakeholders)
- We struggled with the population categories
- Need a legislative mandate and resources to build capacity and access to data (disaggregated)
- Financial
- Role of staff to forge relationships/networking
- Planner as administrator vs. social advocate
- Constitutional and legal restrictions to apply
- Need to bridge other policies
- All social determinants should be considered for each group (need a step-by-step process. Social determinants might need an extra step)
- Identify additional stakeholders – level of engagement; depth of engagement strategies included
- Understanding limitations of authority – highlights need for other policies, regulations, tools
- What role do professional associations and government networks (UBCM, FCM) play in advancing 'equity' conversations?
- Best practice for positive impact of a type of development – evaluation stage is linked to positive impacts
- Toolkit at development transaction point may be of no use/benefit if leverage doesn't exist. This scenario doesn't require rezoning – straight through to building permit so very little leverage to

**Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015**

mitigate unintended consequences re: inequity available.

- How to integrate equity toolkit with other important lenses that must be applied – e.g. climate, environment

What changes to the toolkit would you recommend?

- Create a toolkit for each type of development/proposal i.e. buildings/reg/OCP etc
- Need to use this at the right time in the process – front end
- Important to be able to say N/A to some of the boxes
- Clarify the purpose of the tool
- Indigenous connection to land needs to be noted in the toolkit
- We don't plan communities at building or parcel scale – we reinforce plans at this scale. Therefore, it would be better to apply the toolkit at community scale when doing local area planning, or updating Official Community Plans, RGSs etc.
- Small community planning perspective: toolkit is too much to consider; would go for “one small win” in a specific area instead.
- Step 4 is most useful – how to mitigate adverse impacts; what to do about it
- Need to use the toolkit with multidisciplinary team
- Include a step for determining level of engagement required – inform – involve – empower
- Needs to be applied across region – all LGs using it or it could be a disadvantage for one
- Show links between positive impacts and success indicators
- Give us lists of:
 - Variety of stakeholders
 - Social determinants
 - Best practices related to certain types of development
 - Levels of engagement
 - Engagement strategies – include mainstream stakeholders, not just marginalized
- Equity checklist for developers that is concise and uses simple language to deliver message to council. Summarize at the end of the matrix
- Recognize need for flexibility within matrix (i.e. some boxes may be N/A to a particular application)

- Used early on this could be useful but need a “light” version that takes less time/effort
- Is the “lite” version for politicians?
- Provide clear goals and outcomes
- Step 5 needs to move
- Mitigation column should be “ameliorate”

Considering Next Steps

To conclude the workshop, participants proposed questions that they felt need to be considered to continue the development and implementation of an equity toolkit.

The following five questions were posed, along with some specific ideas and next steps for continuing the dialogue around the application of an equity lens to day-to-day planning activities:

1. How can we best collaborate, across sectors and agencies, to improve planning from an equity perspective?

Why this question?

- There is a need to breakdown silos and reduce duplication – this can only be done through collaboration
- The toolkit needs to be useable
- Society expects collaboration across organizations
- Agencies and sectors compliment each other
- Provides opportunities to share finite resources and greater surety of funding goals for service agencies
- Policies/Regulations
- Achieving outcomes can take many years – better sharing of data and indicators to measure outcomes is needed

Who needs to be asked/involved?

- Stakeholders
- Top of the Agencies

Considerations:

- Shared or common story, message, language is needed to support work
- Easier to track ROI
- Creates better awareness of organizational challenges
- Change how agencies get \$\$ so that there is less competition between them
- Change power dynamic – we all need to own the solutions

**Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015**

- Sub-regional collaboration

Ideas:

- Tie funding to specific equity performance indicators

Next Steps:

- Create an inter-municipal working group
- Build on existing networks – e.g. DPAC, IAC, ROM – Collaborative
- Consider having multiple agencies share one facility
- Work to establish greater education and awareness

2. What level of leadership and policy might we need from CRD municipalities and what capacities/resources might assist in the ability to use this toolkit in planning endeavours?

Why this question?

- Without resources municipalities cannot support initiatives that work toward these objectives
- Leading change in this area needs a high level of leadership from Councils to get “legs”

Who needs to be asked/involved?

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| • City Councils | • OOG (Government) |
| • Senior Administrators | • Everyday citizens |
| • Reps of Equity Groups | • Agencies in the Community |

Considerations:

- Need to tie this to municipal outcome measures (e.g. in OCP, local plans)
- Participation needs to be voluntary but how can it be facilitated? What incentives are needed?
- What is the best way to present this approach to senior administrators and Councils in municipalities?
- Can getting residents/citizens on board help move this approach forward at regional and municipal levels?

Ideas:

- Municipal Charters
- Inclusion policies and staff to lead within municipalities
- Aboriginal accords between municipalities and aboriginal groups
- Regional accords for municipalities to sign on to
- Creation of Health and Well Being Plan
- UBCM grants to create structures or resources for municipalities

Next Steps:

- Documentation of empirical information to support “business case” for these approaches within

**Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015**

municipalities

- Present rationale and toolkit to senior municipal leadership/administration and council
- Network with community groups and agencies to get them on board and push upward to municipal councils
- Pilot the process in one place and share results among municipal stakeholders

3. How can we overcome the initial barrier of equity denial and acknowledge the discomfort around our privilege?

Why this question?

- A cultural shift is required before action can take place and be integrated throughout the region and society.
- We all need to understand the issue better and how we each influence, or are impacted by, it
- For example: Why believe in equity? Who is the public? What evidence is there to share?

Who needs to be asked/involved?

- Ourselves
- Deniers
- Accepters
- Planners

Considerations:

- Need political will and risk takers to champion and be early allies
- Building equity allies and sustaining them is critical
- Target groups need to be identified that have the ability to influence a shift to acknowledgement of inequity

Ideas:

- Create a safe space for learning and open dialogue
- Provide more information and evidence based data around inequity
- Need a common language and definitions that is accessible and understandable even if it is not comfortable
- Planners need to act as facilitators not advocates or administrators
- Use 3rd parties to facilitate engagement so that local governments are less vulnerable and less open to criticism and/or do not get mired in past mistrust.

Next Steps:

- Develop training:
 - Basic Training:
 - Awareness building
 - Common language across multiple disciplines
 - Advanced:
 - Sector/profession specific
 - Scale specific
 - Socio – soft skills training:
 - Breaking down barriers to acknowledging and talking

Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

- Local statistics/base-lining
- Metrics
- Share concrete examples
- Share past and current stories of inequity to help identify bias, build empathy and create allies.

4. How can we put the toolkit/lens in the hands of citizens/associations/networks so its use is demanded from municipalities?

Why this question?

- Contested “ownership” of land/space e.g. residents vs. planners vs. home owners
- Sharing responsibility and supporting planning

Who needs to be asked/involved?

- No specific participants identified

Considerations:

- Recognize diversity within stereotyped communities
- People respond to issues that are important to them

Ideas:

- Make it accessible and integrate it into community conversations
- Use a common language for citizens to understand planning

Next Steps:

- CRD to ask for input from citizen groups to develop framework
- Connect with community health networks (not in the CRD)
- Identify points in the toolkit that can be applied to, or integrated into, a structured community decision making process

5. How do we place equity planning in the *Local Government Act*?

Why this question?

- This issue needs a champion and way to most quickly address injustice
- Too many people cannot afford to live in the CRD
- The housing environment in the CRD is dysfunctional
- Planning now operates on discrimination and racism

Who needs to be asked/involved?

- No specific participants identified

**Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015**

Considerations:

- Legislative and political backlog exists due to LNG and other economic issues
- Housing is a basic human right
- Need to identify equity in simple terms so that it is understandable

Ideas:

- No specific ideas identified

Next Steps:

- Identify a champion
- Find a way to:
 - Help minorities understand their rights
 - Show the benefits of equity planning
 - Make the issue of equity resonate with the public
 - Gather data to support the new section of the *Act*
 - Implement social education
 - Have community discussions
 - Take the idea to UBCM Health Officers Council

Appendix 1 – Presenter Biographies

Victoria Barr, MHSc, PhD(c)

Victoria Barr is a Healthy Communities consultant with over 20 years' experience in community health, healthy public policy, and social planning. A professional consultant since 1999,

Victoria's consulting work has focused on the ways in which population health is affected by policies and projects in various sectors, including housing, transportation, and social policy.

Victoria is a former President of the Public Health Association of BC, and is currently an

Assistant Teaching Professor at the University of Victoria, where she teaches courses in community and environmental health. She is in the final stages of a PhD program in community planning at the School of Community & Regional Planning at UBC. Victoria's dissertation research involves an in-depth look at how elements of health equity are currently being integrated into local land use planning in BC, and how planners, local government elected officials, public health staff, and community-based groups are working together to address goals around sustainability, social justice, and health. Victoria is one of the few people in BC who is cross-trained in both public health and community planning.

Heather Evans, MCIP, RPP

Heather Evans is a registered professional Community Planner with 15 years of experience, much of it focused on local government planning roles. She currently works as a Planning Consultant (Heather Evans Consulting, 2008-2015). Heather brings a practical understanding of local government and policy-making, and helps to create to innovative plans and policies with creative approaches. Heather has experience working with partners to integrate health objectives and planning objectives.

Bruce Parisian

Bruce Parisian is presently the Executive Director of the Victoria Native Friendship Centre and has been in this position since November 1999. Bruce has worked with government agencies, not-for-profit societies, aboriginal governments and their organizations.

Bruce has over 35 years' experience in planning, developing and evaluating programs, including 17 years with the Federal government as a Programs Manager and 8 years with the Ministry for Children and Families services in Saskatchewan. The client groups on whose behalf the programs have been planned have included women, children, youth, persons in receipt of income assistance, the physically challenged, organized labor, on and off reserve aboriginal populations, and groups disadvantaged due to geographic location and/or ethnicity.

Bruce has a strong commitment to his community, serving as a past member of the Victoria Sister City Committee, executive member of the B.C. Association of Aboriginal Friendship Centers, Past Vice President on the Board of the National Association of Friendship Centers and the Morioka Friendship Society. He is presently the President of the Makola Housing Society, Past Vice President of Surrounded by Cedar Child and Family Services, Past President of Hulitan Family Services and Secretary on the Board of the National Association of Friendship Centres. Other memberships include vice-chair of the South

**Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015**

Island Wellness Society, the President's Advisory committee for the University of Victoria. Of Cree ancestry, Bruce is married with three children and two grandchildren.

Bill Brown, MCIP, RPP

For the past three years Bill has been the Director of Development Services for the Township of Esquimalt. Prior to starting his current role he was the Manager of Community Planning for the Resort Municipality of Whistler and before that he was the Senior Planner for the Town of Banff. Bill holds a bachelor of science in biology and an MA in planning.

Appendix 2 – Planning Scenarios

1. New mixed-use, transit-oriented development proposal:

- The site is already zoned for this purpose; a rezoning application is not required
- New townhouse market housing units:
 - 1-bedroom units
 - 2-bedroom units
 - 10% affordable housing units
- LEED-certified commercial space:
 - Coffee shop
 - Food vendor (grocery or market)
 - Retail store
 - Office spaces
- Nature access:
 - Green space around the development:
 - Flower gardens
 - Grassy areas
 - Ornamental trees
 - Strolling pathways
 - 15 minute walk to park and playground
- Transit access:
 - 5 minute walk to public transit stop
 - Trails and walking paths nearby
 - Bike lanes on some streets nearby
- Public engagement plan:
 - As rezoning is not required, public consultation is not required
 - Engagement will include:
 - Open house and information session:
 - Advertise for open house on website and using print and radio ads
 - Online web updates
 - Email subscription to get development updates
 - Information will be distributed in English

2. New affordable housing development:

- Land already zoned for this use, so a rezoning application is not required
- Development to address gap in housing for low- to middle-income families
- Need was identified using statistics and community profiles
- Unit sizes available:

- 2-bedroom units
- 3-bedroom units
- 12 story building; 60 units
- Laundry will be available in each unit
- Green space:
 - Greenery/plants around building
 - 5 minute drive to nearest park/playground
- Transit access:
 - 5 minute walk to nearest public transit stop
 - Walking paths/sidewalks around building
 - Some bike lanes on nearby streets
- Public engagement:
 - As rezoning is not required, public consultation is not required
 - Public was not consulted or engaged to establish need; need was identified using community-level data
 - Public engagement will include:
 - Online web updates

3. Active transportation infrastructure upgrades:

- Municipal staff consulted with the community to determine what types of improvements might be needed and where
- Public engagement included:
- Hosting sessions targeted at non-users to find out about barriers:
 - Advertised using website, social media and print and radio ads
- Meetings with community businesses to find out about specific needs or considerations
- Conducting surveys with community associations
- Municipal staff then determined which areas were in need of better/more active transportation infrastructure. Deciding factors included:
- Traffic volume and trends
- Grant funding eligibility
- Proximity to nearby amenities (i.e., hospitals, schools, shopping centers)
- Accident/incident data
- Opportunity to connect with another municipality's efforts
- Lobbying efforts from advocacy organizations, businesses or community associations
- Infrastructure upgrades will include:
 - New bike lanes
 - Sidewalk repairs
 - Cross-walks

Capital Regional District/Island Health Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

- New walking paths
- Improved street lighting
- Way-finding signs
- Public engagement will include:
 - Information session about the proposed improvements:
 - Advertised using website, social media, and ads in local papers and radio

4. Update to an Official Community Plan

- Staff are considering necessary updates and changes to their OCP (i.e., rezoning, new zoning bylaw, etc.)
 - OCP will be reviewed by Council at their meetings:
 - Public hearing at 1st and 2nd reading
 - Any necessary amendments made by staff
 - Public hearing at 3rd reading
 - Any necessary amendments made
 - Adoption of new/updated OCP
 - Public engagement:
 - Residents are invited to attend and speak at public hearings
 - Public hearings are advertised using municipal website and ads in local papers and on local radio
 - Public hearings are held in the Council chambers at the municipal hall
 - Council meetings are held during the day

5. New inclusionary zoning bylaw

- The OCP for your municipality already supports this bylaw, it just needs to be enacted
- All new large developments applying for rezoning must provide housing across the affordability spectrum
- An agreement is signed between the municipality and the developer:
 - Developer must provide 20% of the base density of the development site for non-market housing
 - The developer chooses a non-profit housing sponsor
 - The municipality then purchases the non-market housing site from the developer for below market price
 - The municipality leases this site to the non-profit housing sponsor and the developer builds the project
 - There is a specific timeline for completion of the non-market rental housing component of the development; if the timeline is not achieved, the developer will be given an appropriate penalty (i.e., a requirement for more amenities, etc.)
- Public engagement:

**Capital Regional District/Island Health
Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015**

- As rezoning is required, public consultation will also be required to approve each proposal

6. Proposed new community garden

- Proposal to put a community garden in a neighbourhood which lacks sufficient growing space/green space
- Neighbourhood demographics:
 - Culturally diverse
 - Low to moderate incomes
 - Young families and older adults
- Access:
 - Proposed site is close to public transit
 - Proposed site already has 20 parking stalls
 - Pathways around and through the garden will be gravel
- A portable toilet will be available for public use with a code
- A volunteer gardening group has committed to operating and managing the site
- The community garden will have a mix of food-producing plants and ornamental plants which attract local pollinators
- There is no fee to use the garden; plots are given on a first-come first-served basis and then by waitlist order
- Public engagement:
 - Hosted an Open House to let residents know about the proposal and to alleviate any concerns they may have:
 - Held a community recreation center on a weekend day
 - Advertised on website, social media, newspaper and radio ads
 - Survey sent via email to gather feedback on the proposed garden
 - Majority of those who responded to the survey and attended the Open House live within a 10 minute walk of the proposed garden

7. New residential care facility

- Care facility will be replacing an old facility that can no longer meet the needs of its residents; therefore the development of this facility is a community need
- Care facility will be for frail elderly and those requiring 24/7 care; criteria for entry is based on need, not on income
- Building will be a maximum of 6 stories high and will occupy 30-40% of the land on the site
- Area surrounding the building will have grass, gardens, strolling pathways and benches accessible to the community as well as residents and visitors to the facility
- Though the site is currently just a grassy field, it is already zoned for this use so no rezoning is required

Capital Regional District/Island Health Equity Planning Workshop – May 8, 2015

- The views for close neighbours will be impeded, but this is unavoidable
- Neighbourhood:
 - Neighbourhood surrounding the facility has many small businesses, such as coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores and shops
 - Neighbourhood residents have low to moderate incomes
- Transit access:
 - Facility will be located on a major bus route with a transit stop very near to the building
 - Parking for visitors will be underground; overflow parking will be on the street
 - Some of the roadways around the facility have bike lanes, some do not
 - Bicycle parking will be available around the building and underground
- Public engagement plan:
 - Presence at local community events to start letting local residents know about the proposed development
 - Online web updates
 - Email subscription to get updates on the progress of the development
 - Open house and information session:
 - Advertise for open house on website and using local newspaper and radio ads