# STRATEGIES FOR INCLUSIVE CITY BUILDING

Seana Irvine
December 2023

# Strategies for Inclusive City Building

Strategies that advance urban justice must consider the relationship between housing, employment and displacement in order to understand how they intersect to produce social, spatial and economic marginalization (Gillespie et al., 2021). Bringing the theory of urban justice into practice in order to reduce displacement around sites of former industrial production requires a set of innovative tools and approaches that are capable of advancing the principles of equity, democracy and diversity, that challenge the politics of austerity urbanism, and that consider the scope and the scale at which they would be most effective.

For those living in landscapes of industrial ruination, these strategies can be grounded in the theoretical and practical acts of imagining change and reinventing place (Mah, 2012). Peck argues that we need to reimagine cities as sites for social innovation and investment with sustainable models of local governance constructed on the basis of principles like progressive redistribution and as a counter to the  winner-take-all of entrepreneurial cities

(Peck, 2014). Others argue for inclusive community-based solutions with economic policies that target the local level. These advocates stress that policies and programs focusing at the local level are effective given that communities act as sites of resistance and serve as laboratories of democracy where ideas that offer the  promise of broader application can be experimented with (Bunce, 2018; Guinan & O'Neil, 2020; Kelly & McKinley, 2015). These advocates and activists call for systems-based Community Economic Development (CED) approaches that support investing in local social and economic development initiatives and inclusive community participation in the design of local development initiatives. Such alternatives, if they are to hold promise as a new system, must move beyond marginal, small-scale, disconnected and scattered approaches. "The biggest challenge is for the field to expand its vision—to dare to imagine becoming big enough that we are no longer simply a nice alternative, but are becoming the system itself" (Kelly & McKinley, 2015, p. 53).

In 2005, the Democracy Collaborative coined the term Community Wealth Building (CWB) as an umbrella term for economic interventions that seek to intervene not 'after the fact', in an attempt to redistribute economic gains, but rather to reconfigure the core institutional relationships of the economy in order to produce inclusive prosperity with more egalitarian outcomes (Guinan & O'Neil, 2020; Kelly & McKinley, 2015). Local ownership of assets is a defining aspect of CWB. Fundamentally, CWB seeks to "build alternative institutions that promote collective ownership and democratic control of three essential areas in the economy: land, money, and labour" (Kamizaki, 2016, p. 8). CWB looks at ways in which financial flows, property usage, social enterprise models, social procurement, and workforce development can be structured to strengthen the social ecosystem, enhance grassroots democratic ownership and strengthen governance over the community's assets and infrastructure. This allows the benefits that accrue from those assets to be gained by the community for their collective discretion, development and distribution. CWB strategies include employee stock ownership plans, land banks, community benefit agreements, targeted workforce development programs and community land trusts.

One such strategy that can be considered when exploring ways to reduce socio-economic displacement around redeveloping industrial sites, are community land trusts (CLTs). CLTs focus on creating localized affordable housing through alternative, community-based models of land tenure (Bunce, 2020; Bunce & Barndt, 2020; Meehan, 2014). CLTs raise funds for the purchase of land to be held in trust for community purposes with legal restrictions placed on the future sale of land and buildings on it. Thus CLTs de-commodify land and limit the commodification of housing on it in order to prevent profit making by and from increased property value, thereby ensuring long-term affordability (Bunce, 2020). Interest in CLTs has been growing over the past two decades in cities across the global North in response to gentrification's increasing encroachment into traditionally affordable neighbourhoods (Bunce, 2020; Meehan, 2014). In Canada, the US and the UK, some CLT organizations have been established in racialized communities that have experienced the worst effects of public disinvestment in

public housing and the offloading of other social investments to community-based non-governmental organizations (Bunce, 2018). The CLT model works to galvanize public discussion about local solutions for affordable housing and a need for the community ownership and stewardship of land. CLTs also support the collaborative identification of community needs through participatory engagement and value place-based connections of neighbourhood residents (Bunce, 2020).

CED practitioners collaborate with broader movements for systems reform (e.g. living wage campaigns, settler colonialism and Indigenous land rights, climate change) in order to address the underlying, structural economic root causes of poverty and inequality, social unrest, unemployment, racial disparity and environmental degradation (Bunce & Barndt, 2020; Kamizaki, 2016). CLT organizations have often extended their activism beyond the local application of the land trust model itself in order to respond to broader underlying systemic urban issues including "the impact of rapid gentrification and displacement, decreases in affordable housing supply, advocacy for urban food security, and solidarity with ra-

cialized and culturally diverse communities, including building allyship with Indigenous peoples." (Bunce & Barndt, 2020, p. 94). In Canada, the community land trust movement has tended to be more Individualized and ad hoc than in the United States and United Kingdom. In 2017, the Canadian Land Trust Network was founded as a knowledge-sharing forum to ensure the success and growth of the CLT model throughout Canada. There are currently 41 CLTs in Canada owning almost 10,000 residential units) (Spicer & Canadian Network of Community Land Trusts, 2023).

CLTs embody egalitarian decision making and seek to empower communities to address affordable housing constraints through engagement in local land-use planning and economic development in low-income areas. However, it is important to recognize that CLTs have developed in large part as a response to neoliberal austerity politics that have seen the retrenchment of all levels of government in public housing and other social infrastructure. Their efforts remain localized and should not be seen to replace the need for government leadership in affordable housing provision (Bunce, 2020). Stronger CLTs

could in fact be seen to legitimize these hegemonic policies by being absorbed by them, losing their critical edge and worse yet, reinforcing structural inequalities (Meehan, 2014).

Given their relative infancy, it is yet to be seen if CLTs will represent a structural transformation, bringing more land under community control, calling into greater question the commodification of land, and working as a broader movement to influence land use policy regionally and nationally (Meehan, 2014). They are, however, proving themselves as a sustaining force with increasing replicability and some longevity, although they represent a fraction of the housing market and face the uphill battle of decommodifying land in a market-based economy. But in their emphasis on participatory and inclusive decision making in local land use planning and economic development, by fostering a sense of community belonging and through local, secured ownership of affordable residential units, they are empowering communities seeking an alternative to gentrification while building greater public attention and pressure on issues of urban social justice and community rights over land in relation to the threats posed by gentrification (Bunce, 2018).

# References

Bunce, S. (2018). Sustainability policy, planning and gentrification in cities. Routledge.

Bunce, S. (2020). Critical dialogues of urban governance, development and activism: London and Toronto. UCL Press.

Bunce, S., & Barndt, J. (2020). Origins and evolution of community land trusts in Canada. In J. E. Davis, L. Algoed, & M. E. Hernández-Torrales (Eds.), On common ground: International perspectives on the community land trust (pp. 93–113). Terra Nostra Press.

Gillespie, T., Hardy, K., & Watt, P. (2021). Surplus to the city: Austerity urbanism, displacement and 'letting die.' Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 53(7), 1713–1729. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X211026323

Guinan, J., & O'Neil, M. (2020). The case for community wealth building. Polity Press.

Kamizaki, K. (2016). Parkdale community planning study: Building a foundation for decent work, shared wealth, and equitable development in Parkdale. Parkdale Community Economic Development Planning Project. https://parkdalepeopleseconomy.ca/pced-planning-study-report-full/

Kelly, M., & McKinley, S. (2015). Cities building community wealth. Democracy Collaborative.

Mah, A. (2012). Industrial ruination, community, and place: Landscapes and legacies of urban decline. University of Toronto Press.

Meehan, J. (2014). Reinventing Real Estate: The Community Land Trust as a Social Invention in Affordable Housing. Journal of Applied Social Science, 8(2), 113–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1936724413497480

Peck, J. (2014). Pushing austerity: State failure, municipal bankruptcy and the crises of fiscal federalism in the USA. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, 7(1), 17–44. https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rst018

Spicer, J., & Canadian Network of Community Land Trusts. (2023). The 2023 census of community land trusts in Canada (Executive Summary). http://www.communityland.ca/

Marcuse, P., Connolly, J., Novy, J., Olivo, I., Potter, C., & Steil, J. (Eds.). (2009b). Searching for the just city: Debates in urban theory and practice. Routledge.

Slater, T. (2006). The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 30(4), 737–757. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2006.00689.x

Slater, T. (2009). Missing Marcuse: On gentrification and displacement. City, 13(2–3), 292–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604810902982250