



CCPA

CANADIAN CENTRE
for POLICY ALTERNATIVES
MANITOBA OFFICE

Shared Futures

Big Institutions and their Inner-City Neighbours

By Valerie Shantz MA, MPA

March 2012

**Shared Futures
Big Institutions and their Inner-City Neighbours**

By Valerie Shantz

ISBN 978-1-77125-000-9

This report is available free of charge from the CCPA website at www.policyalternatives.ca. Printed copies may be ordered through the Manitoba Office for a \$10 fee.

Please make a donation... Help us continue to offer our publications free online.

We make most of our publications available free on our website. Making a donation or taking out a membership will help us continue to provide people with access to our ideas and research free of charge. You can make a donation or become a member on-line at www.policyalternatives.ca. Or you can contact the Manitoba office at 927-3200 for more information. Suggested donation for this publication: \$10 or what you can afford.



CCPA

CANADIAN CENTRE
for POLICY ALTERNATIVES
MANITOBA OFFICE

309-323 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3B 2C1
TEL 204-927-3200 FAX 204-927-3201
EMAIL ccpamb@policyalternatives.ca

CAW 567
OTTAWA

Acknowledgements

Valerie Shantz is grateful to Jim Silver, who saw this project through from the beginning to its completion. His notes, in addition to those from two anonymous referees, were much appreciated and helped to shape the final product. Lynne Fernandez also provided essential support.

The involvement of community members, institutional representatives and neighbourhood association representatives who agreed to be interviewed was crucial.

The author is pleased to acknowledge the generous financial support of the Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) program of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council through the Manitoba Research Alliance for Transforming Aboriginal and Inner-city Communities, as well as that from The Spence Neighbourhood Association, The West Broadway Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation and the Community Education Development Corporation.



Manitoba Research Alliance

Transforming Inner-city and
Aboriginal Communities



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

Introduction

Low-income neighbourhoods and large institutions can make uncomfortable bedfellows. They are, however, found together in many urban centres due to the 'sticky capital' character of hospitals and educational institutions, and the ways in which the neighbourhoods where they reside have evolved in the face of suburban expansion and inner-city decline. Winnipeg is no exception.

Sticky capital operates in a way antithetical to the dominant messages of globalization. Where globalization is characterized by the mobility of capital, with businesses or factories moving throughout the globe in search of lower wages and more friendly regulatory environments, sticky capital 'sticks' to its location. When large organizations seek to expand their operations and facilities at that location, conflict with surrounding neighbourhoods and questions regarding power, class and neighbourhood survival can ensue. Where large institutions see themselves as contributing to the improvement of an area through investment in growth and expansion, residents may worry about the impact that institutional expansion will have on the residential neighbourhood. These concerns tend to centre on the impacts of housing stock loss, increases in

non-local traffic and parking requirements, and pressures on neighbourhood amenities such as parks and open space.

This paper examines cases of institutional expansion in three neighbourhoods within Winnipeg's inner city. In the West Broadway neighbourhood, Balmoral Hall (BH), a private school, purchased adjacent housing on Langside in 2008 for conversion to student residences and a private daycare. In the Spence neighbourhood, the University of Winnipeg (UW) has embarked on an ambitious expansion plan that involves significant construction and a re-visioning of the UW's role in the downtown. In West Alexander, the Health Sciences Centre (HSC) has continued to expand within the context of a residential neighbourhood populated by a number of health related institutions, within a primarily single and multi-family community. In each case the surrounding neighbourhoods are concerned about the impacts institutional expansion may have on the quality of residents' lives and on the sustainability of their residential neighbourhoods. Each situation offers its own lessons but the issues may be best understood when the three cases are looked at together.

The central theme that dominates these three cases is that of land use conflict. Specifically, there is a fundamental conflict between how institutions wish to use land, and how the communities in which they are located may wish to see land used. This is especially significant, because undeveloped land in inner-city neighbourhoods is in short supply.

This paper is organized around an investigation into one key question. Can large institutions and low-income neighbourhoods work collaboratively to plan their neighbourhoods in a way that is mutually beneficial? In order to answer this question, it is essential to understand the issues that are driving these three cases, and some of the potential challenges to forming collaborative relationships. To aid in this, a brief overview will be provided of the institutions and communities involved. Attention will

be given to understanding the concerns of community residents in Spence, West Broadway and West Alexander about institutional expansion in their neighbourhoods. The perspectives of the UW, BH and the HSC will also be explored. As land use is ultimately a municipal responsibility, attention will also be given to the current and potential role for the City of Winnipeg in these situations.

The paper then considers what lessons can be learned from other community/ urban institutional partnerships and models. Barriers to success will be reviewed, as will suggestions for what good collaborative relationships look like. Existing models for collaboration between low-income neighbourhoods and institutions will be discussed and suggestions will be identified in the conclusion for potential applications to the three Winnipeg cases examined here.

Research Methodology

Research for this project involved three main sources of data collection. The first was observation at three public forums between February and April 2009 at which community representatives and institutional representatives were present. The first forum was held in February 2009 at Pinkham School in West Alexander and featured Frank Lewinberg of Urban Strategies Inc. The Community Education Development Association (CEDA) and West Alexander Residents Association co-hosted this event. The second forum, “Sharing Space: Institutions in Neighbourhoods”, was held at the Ellice Theatre in March 2009 and featured a presentation by American academic Dr. Ken Reardon. This event was presented by the Spence Neighbourhood Association (SNA) and the West Broadway Development Corporation (WBDC) and supported by several local community-based organizations, as was the third forum, held in the same location later the next month. This third event featured representatives from the SNA, the UW and the Keep It A Home (KIAH) coalition of the West Broadway neighbourhood in a moderated discussion. It also featured a read-aloud written statement from a Balmoral Hall representative unable to be in attendance.

The second major source of research for this project was interviews with 18 community and institutional leaders between May and August 2009. These interviews were primarily individual, but also included two small focus groups. Community leaders have been defined, for the purposes of this project, as those who have formal roles that place them in positions of leadership within the community (i.e. staff at neighbourhood associations), and those who are seen to carry strong non-formal leadership roles (i.e. long-term residents who have been publicly active in community organizing). Institutional leaders are defined as those who are seen to have a key role in decision-making as it relates to the expansion into and the relationship with the surrounding community or those who have a primary role in communicating with the community on behalf of the institution. The final source was data from the *2006 Census of Canada*. This material provides context for understanding the neighbourhoods in the case studies.

This study also includes a review of existing literature on relationships between large institutions and the low-income neighbourhoods in which they are located. These secondary sources focus on large institutions and their expansion

within low-income residential neighbourhoods, and the relationship between the two, with particular emphasis on models for collaboration and cooperation in planning shared neighbourhoods.

Each of these cases is rich and deserves full detailed exploration in another forum. This

paper does not offer an exhaustive view of the communities, the institutions, or their past relationships, and instead focuses on the challenges and possibilities of collaboration between communities and institutions in planning major new developments.

Assumptions

Before moving forward it is worth laying out four assumptions that underpin this research. One is that institutions tend to expand. Another is that residents in low-income communities tend to have less formal power than the institutions housed within their neighbourhoods. A third is that, in these circumstances, conflict of some kind is virtually inevitable. The fourth is that conflict can, under the right circumstances, be productive.

The seeming inevitability of institutional expansion creates tension in a number of ways. Expansion can be seen as an indicator of organizational success and is therefore desirable for institutions; it can also be a necessity. In the case of BH, for instance, expansion was planned to compete with other private schools in order to sustain and enhance existing levels of enrolment by providing additional services such as day-care or campus residences. Whatever the cases for expansion, communities can feel impinged upon as institutions grow. Another way in which this creates tension is that in environments of scarce resources, particularly for most public sector initiatives, this expansion must come at the cost of something. Limited financial resources cause tensions but so too do limited amounts of land.

This land scarcity in urban centers is particularly important because of its impacts on housing, recreation, green space and the way in which land gets used more generally. For example, how land gets used affects traffic, parking and other aspects of urban planning. These are not simply decisions about individual pieces of land.

Each of the three cases examined in this report has the potential for conflict and in each of these cases this conflict is most likely to be played out on issues regarding land use. It is no coincidence that these three cases are found in the inner city, nor is it insignificant that they are in communities where the average income is far below the average for Winnipeg and where the difference in influence and power is particularly magnified. It is the combination of this triangle of successful and expanding institutions, low-income and less powerful residents, and scarce land resources in inner-city neighbourhoods that creates a recipe for conflict.

While the potential for conflict could be focused on at length, this research is primarily interested in locating solutions for both the institutions and residents involved and the neighbourhoods in which they are located. Another way of stating the central question of this paper

therefore is: is there a way for large institutions to meet their objectives, and have a healthy partnership with their immediate neighbours, to the mutual benefit of each? Put more specifically: are there models that exist that could be adapted to these three Winnipeg cases and if so, what are the necessary ingredients for positive institutional/community land use collaborations?

These three case studies demonstrate that conflict is often rooted in structural realities: the necessity for important institutions to expand at certain times; the relative scarcity of land

in the urban centre; and the severe shortage of low-income housing, as well as green space and recreational space in such neighbourhoods. Unfortunately, conflict can also be expressed at an individual level. That is, conflict can be interpreted in terms of 'personality' clashes rather than as the product of structural realities and when this happens mistrust can be intensified. Until the structures themselves are understood and addressed, it is unlikely that conflict can become productive. It is to these structures themselves that we must first turn our attention.

The Context

West Broadway, Spence and West Alexander: Understanding the Neighbourhoods

The Spence, West Alexander and West Broadway neighbourhoods each have their own distinctive characteristics, but also share many similarities. They are all part of what the City of Winnipeg categorizes as the western part of downtown. They are all inner-city neighbourhoods that have strong community-based organizations, like the Spence Neighbourhood

Association (SNA), West Broadway Development Corporation (WBDC), and West Alexander Residents Association (WARA). They all include committed and long-term residents with attachment to the geographic area in which they live, many of whom have experienced the difficulties created when poverty is spatially concentrated. An overview of some key indicators can serve to highlight some of these similarities and their difference with the city as a whole.

TABLE 1

	Spence	West Broadway	West Alexander	City of Winnipeg
Total Population 2006 and % change since 2001	4,260 (+13%)	5325 (+5.6%)	4000 (-3.5%)	633,451 (+2.2%)
Aboriginal Identified (%)	30.9	23.9	18.1	10.2
Visible Minorities (%)	40.5	13.3	48.5	16.3
Population with no educational certificate, diploma or degree (%)	36.9	26.9	39	23.1
Labour Force participation rate (%)	56.3	65.5	63	68
Employment Income in 2005 (\$)	17,625	17,639	19,951	33,518
Median Household Income in 2005 (\$)	20,379	18,524	32,573	49,790
Single female head of household (%)	34.4	39.1	31.1	16.2
Dwellings in need of major repair (%)	18.0	14.8	13.2	8.5
Residents who did not move between 2005- 2006 (%)	63.6	67.8	76.1	84.9
Residents who did not move between 2001 – 2006 (%)	30.7	28.9	42.1	59.1

SOURCE: Winnipeg Neighbourhood Profiles as compiled by the City of Winnipeg and Statistics Canada (Canada, 2008)

In the above table we see that both Spence and West Broadway are growing communities with a higher than average proportion of Winnipeg's considerable Aboriginal population. Spence and West Alexander also have higher than average visible minority populations. In all three communities we see populations with lower rates of education than average, but also labour force participation rates in West Broadway and West Alexander that are not far off the city average. Despite this employment rate, employment incomes in each of these communities are much lower than the city average, leading to significantly lower median household incomes. This suggests that many people are working, but they are working at low-paid jobs. In addition to these indicators which are common to many other low-income inner-city neighbourhoods, we see other poverty-related issues such as a higher rate of single-mother households, higher rates of dwellings in need of major repair, and higher rates of residential mobility.

These statistics provide a part of the story but the story is far from only bad news. These are neighbourhoods with vibrant identities,

strong community-based organizations, and a growing sense of satisfaction by residents (Silver 2009; Toews 2009). The growing populations are due in part to the work of neighbourhood-based organizations such as the WBDC and the SNA which have implemented strategies to reclaim and redevelop vacant boarded residential buildings and tax sale properties. Additionally, a shortage of good quality rental property in the city as a whole has led to increased private investment (which has a natural consequence of increasing the cost of home rental and ownership in these neighbourhoods).

All three neighbourhoods were also designated Housing Improvement Zones under City of Winnipeg Housing Policy¹ and receive funding from the City to support housing initiatives, from the Province via Neighbourhoods Alive!, and from the federal government through the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program RRAP. There is a great deal of good work happening in each of these communities, much of it initiated by residents, facilitated through community-based organizations, and to a greater or lesser degree, supported by government.

Balmoral Hall, the University of Winnipeg and Health Sciences Centre: The Institutions

Balmoral Hall (BH), a private school for girls K-12, started as a gift of a building to the United Church of Canada from Sir James Aikins, whose requirement was that it be used as a school for girls. The Riverbend School for Girls, named after the first building opened in 1929, was later renamed Balmoral Hall. In 1967 and 1980 additional facilities were added through expansion, and in 1987 the Gar-Neil apartments were purchased to allow for relocation of the residence (Balmorall Hall, 2010).

The West Broadway neighbourhood and school have co-existed since BH's establishment and have grown up around each other. Until the 1960s many of the students who attended the school would have come from the surrounding area. With the rise of the suburbs the character of the inner city changed, while BH remained in its location — an instance of “sticky capital.” As the neighbourhood shifted from affluent to low-income, connections between the two atrophied.

BH's plans for expansion have been more modest than those of HSC and UW but caused significant concern in its neighbourhood. BH moved to establish a day care centre and more student residences through the purchase of three houses and two apartment buildings adjacent to

the school. A local group, Keep It a Home (KIAH), mobilized to successfully fight the conversion of one of the homes into a daycare and the project was rejected by City Council (WB interview; BH interview). They have since sold the houses, but have retained ownership of the apartment buildings without clear plans of how they will proceed (BH interview).

The University of Winnipeg was established in 1967 from the former United College which itself formed in 1938 following the merging of Manitoba and Wesley Colleges.² This public liberal arts and science institution offers undergraduate degree programs in addition to select graduate programs. In addition to its post-secondary programming, the UW's Collegiate enrolls about 700 high school students and its Continuing Education Division offers a variety of diploma and certificate programs.³ It is home to over 1200 faculty and staff, plus over 10,000 students and is located in the Spence neighbourhood.

In 2005, the University announced that it was establishing a University of Winnipeg Community Renewal Corporation whose purpose was to respond to “a broad range of needs which have been identified through extensive internal and community consultations.”⁴ These identi-

fied needs included the development of student housing, a recreation area, transit mall, commercial/retail amenities and new University facilities. The extensive community consultations referred to above include those conducted in 2004 and 2005 and are often referenced in the 2007 Campus Renewal Strategy that calls for a significantly expanded UW footprint.

Due to the nature of the University's work, individual departments have ongoing relationships with the neighbourhood. For example, the Faculties of Education and Science, and programs like Urban and Inner-City Studies and Women's and Gender Studies, as well as others, offer programs or undertake research about or for the surrounding neighbourhood. The UW also encourages its immediate neighbours to attend the UW and has developed initiatives for inner-city residents such as Eco Kids on Campus, aimed at welcoming inner-city kids on campus, and the Wii Chiiwaakanak Learning Centre and Global Welcome Centre, which provide computer access and classroom space outside of the main campus with a stated intention to increase opportunities for community participation.⁵

The Health Sciences Centre was established in 1973 through an Act of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, which brought together a number of health care institutions including the Winnipeg General Hospital, the Children's Hospital, the Manitoba Rehabilitation Hospital as well as the D.A. Stewart Centre (Respiratory Hospital). Later CancerCare Manitoba was joined to the HSC complex. In 2000, the HSC was amalgamated with the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority (WRHA), and ever since has been governed by the WRHA.⁶

The HSC is the largest hospital in Winnipeg and the largest health care referral, teaching and research centre serving Manitoba, Northwestern Ontario and Nunavut. Multiple medical services are encompassed at the HSC and the University of Manitoba has its Faculties of Medicine, Pharmacy and Dentistry as well as

Physiotherapy and Respiratory Therapy located within its campus. HSC has one of the largest facilities of its kind in Canada, located on 32 acres of land in the West Alexander neighbourhood, and adjacent to several other health-related institutions, including the Cadham Provincial Laboratory and the Canadian Blood Services main building. It employs approximately 6000 people and thousands of patients and visitors visit its facilities each week.⁷

HSC has a history of expansion, which deserves a more thorough review in another forum, which has led to tense relations with its neighbours who wish to see them confine their expansion within their current land holdings rather than expanding in ways that require new land. At one point plans for HSC expansion called for the removal of a street of housing (HSC Interview: 2009), but this plan has been halted. HSC has in the past demolished housing on Winnipeg and William Avenue to make way for a parkade and the University of Manitoba removed housing on McDermot for the construction of the Faculty of Pharmacy as well as accessory parking. Residents were successful in lobbying the province to convince the WRHA that HSC should not be able to expand the existing parkade on William Avenue, and an alternate location within the campus' existing footprint was developed, but the plan for expansion continues. The Women's hospital is currently under construction on Elgin Avenue on the site of the former Weston Bakery, a research centre attached to the hospital has been constructed and an eleven story hotel is planned and has been approved by City Council.⁸ In the case of the Siemens Research Centre, which resulted in a loss of green space, and the hotel planned for William Avenue, the residents have not been as successful in significantly influencing development plans. The early success with the parkade, however, did seem to alter the relationship between the neighbourhood and the HSC, who now had experience with the power of mobilized neighbourhood residents.

Where they meet

In general the reputations of large institutions are tied more directly to the health of their community than might be the case with private businesses who have the option of choosing another location. In each of the cases considered in this study the perception that the surrounding neighbourhood is safe for visitors from the 'outside' has become an important project for the institutions. Unfortunately some of this can feel to area residents as if the institution is protecting its staff, students and visitors from the institution's neighbours. This is typified in the UW's Safe Walk program in which students and staff can ask for security to accompany them to their vehicle or bus stop, or the twelve-foot perimeter fencing and chained gates at Balmoral Hall's entranceway, creating a kind of gated community within a community. The focus of the U of W SafeWalk is on getting students and visitors from the institution to their car without undue harm, presumably from activity going on in the neighbourhood. It is not surprising that local residents can be offended, the vast majority being peaceful and law-abiding citizens not wishing to be cast as dangerous or, as living in a dangerous environment themselves. Residents point out that the institutions also bring many strangers into the

neighbourhood, not all of them welcome. One West Alexander resident suggested an alternative viewpoint on the question of safety.

you're bringing so many people visiting this hospital... who knows where these people are coming from. You know they could break into our car in the middle of the night and then go home after their visit in the hospital... because there's going to be all kinds of people having babies, you know, you don't just have honest people having babies. (West Alexander Interview 3: 2009)

It is rare, however, for inner-city neighbourhoods to have their perspectives aired in public. The media tend to praise capital expansion as a presumably positive thing, without much attention to the needs, values, and concerns of local, inner-city residents. Raising concerns about institutional expansion, by inner-city residents, is further complicated because the neighbourhoods in which they live tend to be portrayed negatively in the media.

In short, we find big, "sticky capital" institutions located within inner-city communities that are struggling — often quite effectively given their limited resources- with poverty-related

characteristics and the changing natures of their neighbourhoods. These big institutions have large budgets, significant numbers of employees, and are important economic players providing valuable services to the city and province as a whole. The neighbourhoods in which they are located have relatively few financial resources at a household or community-level and work hard to create safe and healthy spaces in which to live and raise their families. It is the juxtaposition of expanding sticky capital and low-income residential inner-city neighbourhoods that creates

a situation that is, in *structural* terms, ripe for conflict over land use.

This inevitable conflict may also offer the greatest rewards for collaborative planning processes as both the neighbourhood's and institution's futures are so inextricably tied. If institutions are destined to grow, and the neighbourhoods that they live in continue to feel the pinch of this expansion, it is entirely worthwhile to consider the creation of collaborative mechanisms designed to find mutually agreeable solutions to this challenge.

The Role of Municipal Government

As discussed above these are neighbourhoods where all three levels of government have invested in neighbourhood renewal and housing enhancement. It is the municipal government in particular, however, that has specific responsibilities. Under The City of Winnipeg Charter the City must adopt, as by-law, development plans that outline policies of sustainable land-uses and development. In short, land use is ultimately a municipal responsibility.⁹

A secondary plan is a by-law adopted by City Council that applies to a certain part of a municipality, such as a neighbourhood. These documents, which focus on a smaller, more focused scale than a development plan might, are intended to be visionary blueprints rather than implementation tools. A secondary plan can be changed at the municipal level, in contrast to a development plan that requires Provincial approval for change, and secondary plans must comply with the development plan. Not all neighbourhoods in Winnipeg have secondary plans, but they are required in new neighbourhoods.¹⁰

There is a West Alexander/Centennial secondary plan in place. Its by-law requires that a master

plan for redevelopment of the institutional 'zone' be developed before further expansion beyond the HSC Campus proceeds. The question remains: who should lead the development of this master plan and who funds the activity? As both the HSC and WARA wish to have influence in the process, this will need to be resolved. Also, as the by-law speaks specifically to institutional development, it does not address residents' concerns with changes to the secondary plan by applicants wishing to develop outside of the scope of the adopted by-law.

In its 2006 Housing Plan the SNA formally requested that the City undertake a secondary plan by 2011 to address changes occurring primarily due to growth of the University.¹¹ This has not yet proceeded. West Broadway residents, through the WBDC, have also expressed a desire for a secondary plan. A WBDC representative indicates, "the lack of this [plan] is a huge part of this problem."¹² It is clear there are rich possibilities for the City to respond to neighbourhood and institutional concerns through the development of secondary plans to entrench processes that promote sustainable land use and long-term neighbourhood health and cohesion.

Literature Review

Due to the breadth of literature available in the fields of health, education, urban planning, collaboration and inner-city studies, to name a few of the fields these cases touch, it is not possible within the scope of this paper to give them full voice. Instead, this portion of the research represents an attempt to locate the literature most instructive for understanding the land use conflict in these three cases. In looking to other communities to shed light on the situation in these three Winnipeg inner-city neighbourhoods, we can find a number of models that describe potential arrangements within neighbourhoods between predominantly low-income residents and their large institutional neighbours.

There is significant literature in this field focused on neighbourhoods where poor residents live beside a large post-secondary educational institution. This focus is due in part to the changing nature of universities and how they have been affected by the same demographic shifts that are affecting our cities in general. Rosalie Greestein of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy in the US suggests that there is a heightened interest in general in how urban universities approach their real estate.

Factories have left the cities. Regional department stores have been replaced by national chains. Local banks have been bought by regional banks that have, in turn, been bought by national banks. The suburbs are growing faster than the cities and are wielding increasing political clout. Urban universities, however, rarely abandon their cities. Thus, it is no wonder that those of us interested in the development and redevelopment of our nation's cities are very interested in the real estate activities of colleges and universities. (In Weivel and Perry 2005: xi.)

Sticky Capital: understanding the institutions that remain

This idea — that some institutions remain when others have left — is also relevant to the other two institutions in these case studies. They have done something that many private companies have chosen against — remain in the inner city. While retail and many service companies are drained from the downtown and city's core to the suburban and exurban fringe of cities, schools and hospitals tend to be less mobile.

Suburbanization, globalization and the growing spatial concentration and racialization of poverty have meant that Winnipeg's city centre and North End are disproportionately the home of those who have been left out of the secure job market. As Silver (2010) discusses, this hollowing-out happened as the suburbs grew, taking many support services and businesses with them. Such an exodus is neither possible nor desirable for all institutions, however, and the three institutions in these case studies have chosen to remain in their locations despite the shifts in the demographics of the neighbourhoods in which they reside. While Balmoral Hall and the UW, for example, may initially have been established within middle and upper-class communities of those most likely to attend their institutions, this is no longer the case (Burley, 2008).

Urban universities and their affiliated hospitals usually do not leave their central city locations due to their heavy investment in real estate and buildings as well as the strong identification of their alumni with where they attended (Maurasse, 2001). For many, the institution is the building(s) itself and so an entirely new building in a new location would break with their conception of the institution. This is what leads to the notion of 'sticky capital'. Unlike private, for-profit businesses that may choose to change locations for more favourable service arrangements (i.e. reduced taxation, lower wages, a perceived improvement in safety, better access to transportation routes, or different neighbourhood aesthetics), universities and hospitals are unlikely to move.

Normaltown, Athens — a Case Study

Deborah Martin (2004) offers an example of a neighbourhood that resisted definition by its neighbour institution and ensured its own concerns were heard and addressed rather than dwarfed by institutional interests. She chronicles the conflict between a hospital in Normal-

town, a neighborhood in Athens, Georgia, and the residents of Normaltown who vigorously protested the hospital's plans for expansion in the late 1990s. One aspect of this case that may lend insight into the HSC situation is the fundamental misunderstanding between the hospital's governing body, and community members, on how to characterize the neighborhood. Board members of the hospital referred to it as a 'slum' whereas community members saw it as their home. The stereotyping and stigmatizing of inner-city neighbourhoods and their residents, so common in Winnipeg's inner city (Comack & Bowness 2010), is not helpful in such cases.

Conflict between the hospital and the community was intensified by what community members saw as a history of poor treatment of the neighbourhood by the hospital, including the replacement of houses with hospital buildings and doctors' offices, and impending plans to destroy over sixty houses, many of which were owner-occupied. This plan was perceived by the residents of Normaltown as evidence that the hospital did not respect the residential character of the area and echoes many of the concerns voiced at the February 2009 West Alexander community meeting regarding future HSC expansion.

Martin (2004) suggests that the main difference between the residents and the hospital was in how the parties defined their constituency, or 'scale'. Where residents described the conflict as being about the immediate hospital surroundings and defined the space as residential and social, the hospital saw the area as merely a *functional* location to achieve much broader regional social service (health care) and commercial goals. Ultimately the hospital placed itself on a scale that was regional and economic; community members defined the conflict as about use of neighborhood space. Ultimately in the Athens case local residents were able to engage the hospital, due to a successful protest movement, in a way that the municipal government had refused. They were successful in achieving collaborative

governance with the hospital through the form of an advisory committee that included community designates as well as representatives of the hospital.

Models for Negotiating Solutions to Conflicts

In her work on urban planning Leonie Sandercock (2003: 213) encourages parties involved in negotiating conflicts to recognize the role that emotion plays and to embrace this element of the necessary work:

Conflictual relationships involve feelings and emotions like fear, anger, hope, betrayal, abandonment, loss, unrecognized memories, lack of recognition, and histories of disempowerment and exclusion. Obstinacy or blindness about such emotional matters can stall reconciliation or conflict resolution.

This recognition regarding the role of conflict is important but so too is the shape that the parties take in seeking to address their conflicts. Perry and Wiewel (2005:13) offer two models for mitigating institutional/ neighbourhood conflict over land-use decisions. The first is for institutions to work directly with intermediary organizations such as neighbourhood associations. One example they present is Campus Partners, established in 1995 by Ohio State University. In this example the University appoints the majority of the board of Campus Partners, with city and community representatives making up the remainder. Perry and Wiewel (2005: 307) note, however, that this body has not been without conflict itself.

The second model calls for the creation of purpose-formed advisory committees, assembled for specific projects and purposes. These temporary committees advise, require less start-up time, or staff support, and may be more flexible and adaptable in the long run.

Perry and Wiewel (2005) also provide insight into predicting where conflict may arise by sug-

gesting that community conflict about land availability or the condition of the neighbourhood can be mitigated by healthy existing relationships. If there is a degree of present and past collaboration between large institutions and their low-income neighbours, there is less likely to be significant conflict. This observation is relevant to all three cases. In the case of West Broadway and Balmoral Hall, the relationship has been largely one of cohabitation without communication. While there has been some community frustration at the “SUV parade” of relatively well-to-do parents dropping off and picking up their children, there was little communication between Balmoral Hall and the neighbourhood until conflict over land use arose. Balmoral Hall had cultivated relationships with a local public school and a community youth outreach program, but these targeted approaches are primarily viewed as a ‘charity approach’, rather than an approach to build community with their neighbours. In the other two cases, institutions have fences to mend due to land use decisions from the recent past that have contributed to an environment of distrust. It is possible that a desire to deal with just these kinds of problems provides an opportunity for the creation of genuine community partnerships.

Victor Rubin (2000) notes that the nature of university—community partnerships has evolved rapidly in recent history. As partnerships between post-secondary, and local communities become more commonplace, so too does the literature describing this activity. Rubin argues that the development of an intellectually rigorous framework for evaluation of partnerships must be based on meaningful questions relating to the core objectives of the partnerships, not just on output measurements. He cautions that these relationships are not simple, but that the complexity of these partnerships is in part due to the essential need for trust, strong relationships and strong social capital. Rubin (2000: 222) points to Ken Reardon’s work on the East St.

Louis Action Research Project (ESLARP) through the University of Illinois, as a good example of a self-study account by participants which chronicles how universities have had to rethink their motives, practices and assumptions regarding community-university partnerships.

Reardon presented on these ideas in Winnipeg in 2009 at an event hosted by the Planners Network- Manitoba, WBDC and SNA, along with other community-based organizations. He noted that universities are motivated to promote these partnerships for a number of reasons. Universities are increasingly understood as important economic engines within communities, aiding in the attraction of public and private dollars to the institutions. At the same time they are competing for faculty, staff and students. The local community can help in attracting, or discouraging, this recruitment. The pressures to expand the physical boundaries of universities demand that these institutions develop cooperative relationships in order to gain support for their plans for institutional expansion. Due to the growing understanding of their power and influence as employers, real estate owners and product and service purchasers, there is increasing pressure on universities to use this power and influence responsibly (Reardon 2005: 4).

In his review of 135 campus/community partnerships, Reardon (2005) suggests the ten most successful shared a number of common characteristics. They tend to concentrate on efforts to expand employment, entrepreneurial, and investment opportunities, giving particular attention to small businesses, women and minority entrepreneurs. Each of the partnerships encountered significant institutional and community obstacles. These obstacles were sometimes due to academics from disciplines unused to working together as well as challenges arising from working with community leaders who were skeptical due to past conflicts with the institution. As a result of this distrust academics often had to make repeated efforts to build trust by

demonstrating their commitment to long-term change in the relationship with the community. This alone demonstrates the need for community/campus partnerships to evolve over time and not be rushed.

Based on these characteristics of success Reardon (2005: 10) provides the following guidelines for forming campus/community partnerships:

- Partnerships must allow both parties to see the benefit of continued involvement.
- Successful partnerships require strong and continued leadership at the executive level of the university, local government, and key community representatives.
- Ideally both university and community organizations will have skilled staff who can understand each other's perspectives in order to create cross-understanding, communication and trust.
- Successful partnerships develop slowly. Reardon notes that in his research successful partnerships required 5 - 10 years to move from small initiatives to more substantial institutional reform.
- Both campus and community leaders need to be genuinely interested in reflecting, learning from and adjusting to the challenge of mistakes. Without this element the partnership is likely to collapse.

Ultimately, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach, Reardon (2005: 10) suggests that the most appropriate partnership model is one that is flexible and able to adapt to the unique political environment, history and nature of the community and collaborating organizations.

Prior to Reardon's presentation in Winnipeg, Frank Lewinberg, of Toronto's Urban Strategies Inc, was invited twice to Winnipeg about a potential institutional expansion within the West Alexander neighbourhood. In 2007 the HSC invited him to talk to institutional leaders about his firm's experience in planning Toronto's MaRS

(Medical and Related Sciences Centre) and to discuss the potential of leading a Master Planning process. West Alexander residents discovered this and became concerned about how the process would be led and by whom (West Alexander interview: 3). Lewinberg was then invited back to speak to the West Alexander residents at a session at Pinkham School in February 2009 to talk about this and other projects, as well as about his experience in planning institutional expansion with community benefit as a focus.

Lewinberg reported that as HSC, the University of Manitoba medical school and the Federal Virology Lab are all growing (and in potentially interrelated ways) they recognized that they have the potential to co-exist more formally.¹³ He suggested that these institutions have a choice. They can invest their capital dollars in ways that improve the surrounding community; or they can invest in ways that make it worse. The planning model that Lewinberg promotes places heavy emphasis on developing a vision for the neighbourhood, and embodying that vision in a master plan that ensures the project aligns stakeholder opportunities, focuses where investment should take place, creates value and communicates potential. He sees the master plan as the physical expression of the vision, and the vision as a product of the shared and negotiated needs of the institution and the neighbourhood.

To achieve this he suggests that a steering committee is essential in order to create legitimacy and profile, institutional buy-in, community support and to leverage funding. This steering committee cannot be comprised solely of institutional representatives if it is to be successful. Instead Lewinberg suggests that it is essential that the committee have representatives of the major institutional stakeholders as well as local community residents, private sector funders and governments. The formation of this steering committee is both delicate and essential because “If the steering committee [members] can’t talk to each other there is no hope.” It is the creation of a

functional and representative steering committee that Lewinberg sees as creating the foundation for all future work. He then sets the committee’s first task as the development of operating principles that can be agreed upon by all committee members. Once this is in place the committee can manage the rest of the process which places heavy emphasis on neighbourhood input and a decision-making process drawing on ongoing communication with all project stakeholders.

One of the major advantages of this type of collaborative governance activity is that it ensures the institution does not fall into a myopic view of the neighbourhood. In particular it can mitigate the tendency for employees of institutions who live elsewhere, but work in an institution based in the inner city, to ‘see’ a ‘slum’ when they look at the surrounding neighbourhood. Where they may see a slum, those who live in the area see their home, family and friends. This is at least in part about the stereotypes through which the more powerful ‘see’ the less powerful, and the stigma often attached to low-income neighbourhoods. Collaborative planning methods aid in the conversation between what otherwise is too often the ‘two solitudes’, created by the power differential that exists between institutions and individuals.

A final model for understanding the relationship between large institutions and residents is found in the examination of community economic development (CED) principles. These principles, which apply to everything from daily purchasing choices by residents and businesses to long-term investment decisions by individuals and organizations, attempt to guide decision makers to ensure they are contributing to long-term community development. The inner city of Winnipeg has been the site of various CED approaches and home to a number of organizations that embody this philosophy (Loxley 2007).

Within the twelve CED principles, three seem particularly relevant and may help explain the expectation of participation by residents in land use planning. Local decision-making is very im-

portant in this model; grassroots involvement and community self-determination are essential to its implementation. The state of the physical environment with a focus on safe and healthy neighbourhoods is also a key principle. The final principle worth focusing on here is the empha-

sis on neighbourhood stability, which strives for dependable housing and long-term residency. A neighbourhood which has embraced CED principles will expect behaviour of all its residents to respect these ideals, especially its most powerful members, such as institutions are perceived to be.

Findings

There are a number of themes that emerge in looking at these three case studies. They are not independent of each other but instead can be seen as interrelated.

Land Use and Scarcity

It is tempting to view each of these cases independently and to focus on the individual personalities and specific plot variations, but the central theme that dominates each is that of land use conflict. In each case there is a fundamental conflict between how an institution wishes to use land, and how the community in which they are located may wish to use that land.

Given that each of these cases takes place in the inner city, land scarcity only heightens this potential for conflict. Institutions and community organizations are aware that the amount of land that they collectively inhabit cannot grow and therefore, the conflict turns on the competing interests for use of existing land. This in turn is a function, in part, of such regulatory matters as land-use planning regulations and tools such as secondary plans and zoning by-laws.

When institutions expand, they tend to look for land within close proximity to their current

facilities. They tend to centralize their activities rather than dispersing them. Unfortunately, the desire to expand in close proximity to their existing buildings is not always consistent with the interests of the surrounding community that may value the housing or other community facilities that may be lost to or compromised by institutional expansion. When residents have invested time and energy in developing Neighbourhood plans, as in the case of the SNA and the WBDC, they expect that these plans will have some relevance in future planning for the area. Neighbourhood plans such as these are grassroots documents that are brought to the City's attention, but without any regulatory authority for implementation. Ideally neighbourhood plans inform secondary plans but this is not always the case.

In Spence and West Broadway neighbourhood plans remain only suggestive documents, and so when institutions develop land in ways that are at odds with those plans, residents feel disrespected. In the case of West Broadway, the residents interviewed for this study were angry that the potential expansion of Balmoral Hall would be at the expense of low-income housing, forcing out residents who had lived in the neighbourhood for over twenty years. This was

particularly frustrating because the community had so recently worked for five years through the WBDC to build twenty-four housing units in what is now the GreenHeart Co-op. While securing new low-income housing was a long process for the neighbourhood association, Balmoral Hall's proposal involved the removal of the same number of suites with their expansion when they purchased three houses and two apartment buildings that had been long-term housing for community residents. While residents could see the desire for the institution to expand to meet its own needs, they also wanted the institution to recognize their own needs as community residents by confining growth to their current footprint (West Broadway Interview 2 and 3: 2009).

In the case of the Spence neighbourhood, community residents were concerned with the University's removal of a long-standing community recreation facility (the local roller rink), the removal of five homes on Langside near the rink, and the implications of a growing campus. Given the SNA's efforts in facilitating community green spaces and neighbourhood based 5-year housing plans¹⁴, there are particular frustrations with how the University's plans may cause gentrification in the area and inhibit the community from realizing its own plans for retaining affordable housing as well as green space for community residents (Toews 2008). As one community organizer put it:

I see how much time and energy this community has spent making very conscious choices about the difference between a lot used for housing versus green space, and they're big debates for a reason: we're in the inner city; there's a scarcity of resources; there's a scarcity of land. Is their choice of use of land in line with the ideas that the community has of their space? I think we need more debate about that. (Spence Interview 3: 2009)

While the UW has included some affordable housing units as part of its recently opened McFeetors Hall, this housing is primarily meant for

those engaged in some form of education. There is currently no requirement for the University to take the SNA's grass roots plans into consideration in their own development plans, but SNA has submitted them to the City Centre Community Committee under the Planning Property and Development department. The development of a Secondary Plan for the neighbourhood is the most likely way to attempt to have these plans integrated into formalized planning for the neighbourhood.

In West Alexander, residents were very active in organizing against one HSC representative's suggestion that future hospital expansion would require the removal of an entire street of housing (HSC Interview: 2009; West Alexander Interview 1 and 3: 2009). In a neighbourhood with a particularly dense concentration of large institutions, the HSC drew residents' concerns because their plans threatened to further shrink the residential portion of the neighbourhood when low-income housing is already in short supply (MacKinnon 2010; CCPA-Mb 2008).

In each of these cases the land use conflict has had its own particular character, and the institutions and communities involved approached the situation differently. While West Broadway's Keep It A Home (КИАН) coalition coalesced quickly to fight Balmoral Hall's plans through appealing to the City of Winnipeg, there has been little substantive contact between the organization and the community since then to allay future land use conflict. West Alexander residents were successful in influencing the hospital through the provincial government, and this conflict has also led to a closer working relationship between the residents' group and senior hospital staff. Their attempts to work more closely together suggest that future land use discussions have the potential to happen in a more constructive manner and prior to the point of public conflict.

In Spence, the changing nature of both the institution and the residential community suggest that this relationship is a work in progress.

As the University's expansion is the most rapid of these three cases (so much so that the data collected for this study became dated very quickly as additional buildings were added to the University's construction plans), it seems their need for community consultation was the most pressing. Instead, the UW sees its consultation work in 2004/2005 leading to the campus redevelopment plan as foundational for their current plans. Residents interviewed for this study indicate that much more is needed and describe the UW expansion as feeling like a kind of siege, unclear where the next expansion may lead or how it might affect their neighbourhood.

I guess the invading armies never, never consider being gracious to, to the members that they're, they're displacing. I feel like that's so sad that [...] people who believe that they're very good can, can just kill the community that they're coming into. You know like they're killing the community; I feel like we're all getting squeezed out. (Focus group: 2009)

Finally, it is important to understand that both residents and institutions are paying costs of various kinds associated with land scarcity and, in some cases the early manifestation of gentrification, especially in the form of rising rents and the displacement of low-income residents. (Toews 2008; CCPA- MB 2008; Silver 2006). A Balmoral Hall representative describes their feeling that the pressures on scarce land are growing as follows:

there was a real concern that this was our neighbourhood and it was really being bought up. There was a lot of condominium developments going in the neighbourhood and we suddenly realized that if we ever did need to look at acquiring more property we weren't going to have any options if we didn't act. (BH Interview: 2009)

In at least one of the neighbourhoods (West Broadway), just as community residents feel their

options for determining their future are shrinking due to limited land availability, so too does the institution see that these same forces may soon limit its own future in the neighbourhood. In this case the school's long-time existence in the neighbourhood has not been responsible for the changing fortunes of the neighbourhood but has stood witness to it. In the cases of both West Alexander and Spence we see a stronger case to be made that the institutions involved are playing a role in shaping their neighbourhoods, and as a result have a different level of responsibility. The significant role of public funds in these two institutions also suggests a different level of responsibility.

Impacts on Affordable Low-Income Housing

Fundamental to the land use conflict discussed above is the relationship between institutional expansion and a loss of affordable, and especially low-income, housing. In each of these cases, people who depend on affordable low-income housing fear that their neighbourhoods may be changing in ways that will squeeze them out. They welcome improvements in their neighbourhoods but reject the notion that housing that they are able to afford cannot be part of the future picture of their community.

In West Alexander this has led to demands for settlements that will allow them to replace their current homes with homes and yards equivalent to those they currently have. The challenge is that given the relatively low housing values in the West Alexander neighbourhood compared with other areas of Winnipeg, this is likely to be more than what is perceived as 'fair market value' for their current homes. At the forum at Pinkham School, there were many questions about the process of land purchase and how prices might be determined. Landowners' concerns, however, will not be able to fully represent the concerns of renters of affordable housing whose options are

shrinking through loss of rental units. (Carter 2008). Particularly frustrated are those who feel specific affinity for the West Alexander neighbourhood and who wish to stay. The message for these residents seems to be that they can move elsewhere, and that their roots, particularly if they are renters, are insignificant.

In Spence neighbourhood there is also concern that UW plans will preclude the potential for new affordable housing in the area or may threaten existing affordable housing. As one resident told me when I asked about her understanding of the expansion plans of the University:

the only thing I know is that low-income people are getting chased out of the neighbourhood; they're getting displaced. That's what I see, because I, I just see more and more that buildings are going up and that's taking over and, and there's no place for low-income people in this neighbourhood anymore! (Focus group, 2009)

In West Broadway, the KIAH coalition formed specifically around the issue of affordable, low-income housing, with an intention to stop the conversion of viable low-income housing into suites for higher income use. Long-term residents of the community point out that they are the most vulnerable to the potential loss of low-income housing. As one KIAH organizer puts it: "Part of this fight is to fight against the dispersal of low-income [people] in the neighbourhood, 'cause a lot of those people, including myself, lived through the bad times. And we're part of the solutions to those bad times." Central to this is the concern that each of the communities in these case studies has seen rough times and has experienced the effects of a hollowing out of the inner city and the attendant problems. Some will debate whether these neighbourhoods are gentrifying or being revitalized but this sense of the loss of low-income housing is not just suspicion. Recent scholarship on Winnipeg's inner city confirms that rents in West Broadway (Silver 2006) and Spence (Toews 2008) in particu-

lar have been rising and that some low-income residents have been displaced.

While the reasons for this loss of affordable, low-income housing are multi-faceted, the actions of 'sticky-capital' around limited land can worsen the problem. For example, as institutions publicly discuss expansion, developers and others can engage in land speculation, driving up the cost of land and causing purchase of existing housing stock purely on the 'bet' that land values in the area will become more expensive in future. In addition to the impacts of land speculation, the expansion of both the UW and Balmoral Hall required the actual removal of affordable housing (Spence Interview 3: 2009; West Broadway Interview 2: 2009).

Of course, institutional growth is not the only factor. Housing prices are on the rise in the City of Winnipeg following a period during the 1980s and 1990s when the inner city experienced high rates of housing and commercial building abandonment, boarding and foreclosures, as the city hollowed out and the suburbs grew. Now that there is some recovery taking place in at least some part of the inner city, there exists a kind of double-bind for residents of increasing costs of existing housing and less availability as housing is removed in some cases by institutions wishing to expand. This ultimately makes it more challenging for those residents who have lived in the area during its redevelopment period to remain.

Recipes for Conflict?

Conflict breeds in situations in which individuals feel uncertain and threatened. In each of these cases, this conflict has taken on specific characteristics depending upon the nature of the pre-existing relationship. Despite their long standing co-existence, interviews with West Broadway residents and representatives, and BH, suggest that there has been little recent ongoing interaction between the institution and the neighbourhood. Instead, there has been a form of parallel exist-

ences. When community residents came out in force to a municipal meeting to oppose the conversion of a single family dwelling into a BH day care centre, school representatives were surprised, with little understanding of residents' concerns (Balmoral Hall Interview: 2009; West Broadway Interview 3: 2009). The sides quickly became polarized. There was virtually no relationship capital to build upon to ameliorate the conflict. The fact that the parties did not know each other, served to accentuate the suspicion and distrust.

History can also play a role. In the early 1980s the UW actively engaged the surrounding community in its plans to build an athletic space (now the Duckworth Centre), promising access for surrounding inner-city community members to the space at reduced, if not free, rates of admission. The resulting community access program was active between 1984–1993¹⁵, but later revised following changes in administrative personnel. Some residents in the neighbourhood still raise this as a sore point and an example of the UW bargaining in bad faith.

Recently the UW has established an Athletics & Academics Task Force aimed at developing stronger sports and fitness programs on campus, and to offer greater opportunities for community participation.¹⁶ Given the history with the Duckworth Centre, this project has particular resonance with the community, and with University administrators. As a senior UW representative indicated: "As an institution you just really have to try not to break your promises and try not to make promises that you can't keep" (UW interview 1: 2009). So too is a sense that more is expected of the UW than other institutions because of its claims to be a leader in the inner city, and its mandate as a public institution.

As the rate of campus expansion accelerates, so too does the sense by community members that there are plans yet unstated that could affect them.

In the interviews conducted for this study many residents in the three cases spoke with a

general sense of distrust of the institutions in their neighbourhood; however it was also notable that the closer the person was to decision makers at the institution (i.e. whether they have developed an ongoing contact there) the lower the level of distrust. Institutions that had developed relationships with the community were better able to discuss the nuances of negotiation and the challenges of meeting multiple concerns. They were less likely to dismiss residents' concerns.

For their part, institutional leaders tended to discuss the communities with some hesitation. In each case, there is an understanding that community residents have some power to stall or affect their plans. One UW administrator indicated that one of the challenges in working with the community was the high turnover rate and the lack of stability in the neighbourhood, which results in positive work by UW not remaining in the community memory. Given that interviews with residents indicated they shared this same concern due to changes that can occur with a turnover within institutional leadership, it seems a solution must be found that is beyond the individual players.

Neighbourhood Associations

The role of the neighbourhood association is of particular interest here. While institutions may hope that these associations can act as bodies that can communicate the desires of the neighbourhood efficiently in a single voice, this is not how the associations view their work. As a representative of the SNA indicated:

[T]he way that we work is we're very open, we're very consultative. So if someone calls me and wants to know what the organization's stance is on "x" or the neighbourhood stance is on "x", those are two different questions but more often than not that involves a bigger conversation than me and the other person on the other end of the phone. And I know that makes it difficult for the university and I understand that. (Spence Interview 3: 2009)

This tradition of extensive consultation is reflected in each of the neighbourhoods to varying degrees and makes relationships between the institutions and their neighbourhoods that much more complex. So too does the expectation that members of a neighbourhood, including institutions, will operate with adherence to CED principles. In each of these neighbourhoods there are a number of strong community-based organizations that have embraced CED principles and residents have come to expect a certain amount of input into the shaping of their neighbourhood. Viewed another way, through applying CED principles, community based organizations embrace community members' expectations of what constitutes a good neighbourhood. As a result, when institutions make decisions that may be extensively debated within the institution, but not discussed with adjoining neighbourhoods until they are close to final implementation, residents feel they have been left out of a process they expected to be a part of.¹⁷

There are many CED principles that institutions such as the UW have made significant strides in applying on a project or programming basis. Most notable is the launch of Diversity Foods Services, which caters to the UW community and beyond and embraces many CED principles, such as a focus on local employment and local investment. At the HSC, recent efforts to work with the Urban Circle Training Centre on employing recently trained north-end residents also indicates movement in this direction. It is this kind of thoughtful activity that makes it clear that large public institutions have the capacity to be more proactive in ensuring these principles are also applied to land use planning, which has long-term impact on the community and outlives the approach of any individual institutional leader. Balmoral Hall has demonstrated less experience in applying these principles, but understanding that its influence on the community in which they are located may help them to understand some

of the resistance and give them options for future planning.

In addition to the specific principles outlined above, CED also highlights a particular understanding of 'community', in which neighbourhoods view local areas as the community. For large institutions, 'community' can be defined as an entire city, or even beyond. It is this kind of shared language with very different meanings that can also contribute to conflict.

This may also help to explain why it seems that the fundamental natures of institutions, inner-city communities and residents' associations may prescribe a certain amount of friction. This is particularly evident with a community in transition such as Spence. While students have always comprised a portion of those living in Spence, other residents perceive them as being temporary and not 'real' residents of the neighbourhood (focus group: 2009). Students, however, are only one part of this changing neighbourhood. As students, UW staff and downtown workers are attracted to Spence's location and housing stock, the long-term residents of Spence cannot be forgotten.

As the neighbourhood transitions, in part due to University expansion, it seems inevitable that some of these long-time residents will begin to feel squeezed out. This can mean that the neighbourhood association can be perceived as being at the centre of that conflict. Their role, as advocates for the residents and neighbourhood as a whole places them in a challenging position. Individual residents will not always feel that their concerns have been communicated because they may on occasion see the Association as being 'in bed' with the institution (Spence focus group: 2009). The institution can perceive the Neighbourhood Association as only presenting concerns and may see communication with it as being less fruitful than more direct communication with residents (UW interview 1: 2009). And so the Neighbourhood Association is left in the middle, attempting to distill and represent

the multiple concerns that make up a neighbourhood. This is a difficult role to play, adding to the complexity of relationships between large institutions and low-income neighbourhoods.

While neighbourhood associations have considerably more power and experience in this type of work than individual residents, they remain engaged in a significant power imbalance relative to the institutions. They will require bolstered resources to be in a position to engage in an ongoing relationship with these large institutions. Some of these resources will be financial but some will also come out of their ability to mobilize residents and other community members to action. They will never match the resources that hospitals or schools have, but neighbourhood associations can, with more support, come to the table to ensure local interests are heard and considered.

What A Good Relationship Looks Like

Relationships are defined in large part by the quality of communication. Without regular communication it is difficult to have a strong relationship. Perhaps one of the most important messages for institutions is that communication cannot be defined as press releases or other one-way forms of messaging. Instead, residents are looking for opportunities to hear institutional plans and to share their own ideas about the future of their neighbourhoods and together, contribute to that shared future.

During the research period for this paper, the HSC had made a concerted effort to improve its relationships with the West Alexander community by participating in the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation (CNDC), a key community organization. Following the residents' success in blocking expansion plans due to concerns about the loss of housing, HSC recognized the power of the residents. As one senior administrator indicated: "that was a real lesson for us because... it doesn't make sense

... to be in a situation where you've got all your neighbours around you hating you, or not liking you. Whether you're an institution or whether you're a resident" (HSC Interview: 2009).

This case also reminds us that residents for their part need to be organized and prepared to make it clear to institutions that they have the power to voice their concerns in public and will do so if needed. This is, in fact, the strongest power that resident groups have in a situation of power imbalance, and in the case of both West Alexander and West Broadway, this type of action has met with success.

While the HSC has chosen to develop relationships with community leaders through participation in the CNDC, the UW has preferred to work with individuals (UW Interview 1: 2009). This form of relationship building is, however, time consuming and challenging. "How do you really find out what people are thinking — the only way you can ever do that is just by going out and meeting with people, but there aren't a lot of places that have the budget to be able to pay somebody to go out and just meet and communicate with people" (UW Interview 1: 2009). The fragility of the relationship was also apparent in discussions with community leaders.

[w]e have a great relationship in a lot of ways - a number of professors that we work with on a regular basis, students that volunteer work with us, live in the community, professors that live in the community [...] And certainly there's efforts by the University in terms of Wichiwaakanak [...] but there is on the other side, a sense that there is not a real partnership, that the University does not see itself as a part of the community [and] things like neighbourhood plans [...] may or may not apply to the University depending on how connected it is feeling to the community at that point in time. (Spence Interview 3: 2009)

Community representatives see some positive signs in the current administration in terms of

their stated intention to be more engaged with community. One neighbourhood leader cautions, however, that community engagement activities, while important, cannot trump difficult land use conflict discussions and that to be a good neighbour all involved must “see your neighbours as neighbours, and take their issues as your issues, and set up opportunities for actual discussion” (Spence Interview 3: 2009).

In West Broadway, community members have encouraged Balmoral Hall to take a more active role in the community by becoming involved and helping to solve what are relatively small problems, such as keeping the gate to the school property entrance open on Langside and continuing to address traffic concerns created by parents who prefer to drive their children to school in individual cars. The development of an ongoing relationship has benefits for the institution as well. In discussing the potential benefits of a community planning group, a West Broadway resident suggests:

the major benefit of these committees is that you are made at least moderately more aware of the needs of each of its members. And so Balmoral Hall could have said, listen we’ve got a vandalism problem over there, and if they’d already established a good relationship and [were] willing to help others, others would have been willing to help them I’m sure. I’m positive of it (West Broadway Interview 1: 2009).

Opportunities For Institutions

Sticky capital presents neighbourhoods with a conundrum. These institutions are generally large and heavily invested in their physical structures which can cause problems; but their historical and financial investment also means that they may be more open to the concerns of the communities as a whole. As ‘sticky capital’ they are more vulnerable to critiques and political interventions by their immediate neighbours and

more likely to see the value in negotiating mutually agreeable outcomes when their expansionary efforts produce strong community resistance. In the case of Balmoral Hall, for example, the school responded to community opposition to their expressed intention to remove scarce low-income rental housing from the local market by halting plans for physical expansion. In the case of HSC, their plans for expansion into residential areas were stopped and future plans, such as the Women’s Hospital, incorporated community residents as participants in the design phase.¹⁸ In the case of UW, the creation of the Community Renewal Corporation and access to the UW administration may indicate an interest in accommodating community concerns.

In each case there are also things that have been handled well. In the case of West Broadway, residents note that they have seen some relaxation regarding allowing local children to play on the Balmoral Hall play structures. They see this as one way that BH can help to build community, by providing a green space for local children to play in after school hours. As one resident indicated:

if the kids saw that Balmoral Hall was not only accepting them there, which Balmoral Hall now more or less does (they don’t chase the kids off anymore), and if they were not only accepting them there but encouraging them to come and use what is arguably the best playground in the neighbourhood (...) that would be huge. All the parents would say, well good for you, thank you; appreciate that. (West Broadway Interview 2, 2009)

In the case of HSC, during the period interviews were conducted for this paper, some community leaders saw HSC as taking a welcome and different approach from earlier, less consultative, approaches. The choice to have a member of the HSC management team join the Central Neighbourhoods Development Corporation has allowed for more regular communication be-

tween community representatives and the hospital and provided a clear conduit to the hospital when concerns arise.

Conflict in West Alexander has centred on the HSC but residents acknowledge that they are affected by a group of institutions including the U of M medical school, virology lab, Canadian Blood Services, Red River College, as well as the HSC. Their focus on HSC has come for two reasons. The first is that the HSC is the institution whose expansion has the ability to remove additional housing in the near future. The second is dissatisfaction with the way that the HSC has handled concerns in the past.¹⁹

Those interviewed suggested there were a few tangible things that the HSC could do to immediately improve their relationship with the neighbourhood. One major opportunity is for HSC to use greater influence in their employees' use of the surrounding real estate. There is great dissatisfaction with the use of local back yards for multiple parking spaces, as well as the purchasing of surrounding properties by doctors and other HSC staff as revenue property.

Another is for HSC to be more proactive in anticipating the problems they create for residents as well as in addressing solutions. As one West Alexander resident suggested:

I'd like to see something substantial that they could actually do on their own and then come up to the neighbourhood and say 'look what we've done for you', whether it's all those lights [that] are shining in the backs of people's houses.... You know look at how that light shines, get some shades up there so the light goes down. Or clean this parkade, or get rid of the chain link [and] torn-up fences, and pick the weeds without [having to be] told to do anything. (West Alexander Interview 3: 2009)

The third is to commit to working together with the neighbourhood on a master plan for the area, a plan that is required by the area Secondary Plan.²⁰ In the end the residents' main concern

is with the lack of information shared with the community from institutions planning for expansion as well as, in some cases, the poor planning that results in uglier neighbourhoods.

Residents of the Spence neighbourhood see potential for the UW to contribute positively to their neighbourhood in their plans for a new field house that is more welcoming to community residents. Community representatives note that this project in particular offers an opportunity for the UW to demonstrate the community partnership that it has talked about publicly, by ensuring that community representatives are substantively involved during the planning and implementation phases, as well as during its operation.

The City of Winnipeg: An Enhanced Role

In the preceding sections there is discussion of the need for processes to frame discussions between residents and institutions. There are clearly roles for neighbourhood associations, individual residents and institutional representatives to mitigate conflict and to plan their communities together. However, a recurring theme has been the concern that efforts that may be supported with certain individuals 'at the table' may fall away with changes in staff or other players. While stakeholders should work to anticipate and manage conflict in advance rather than have it arise unexpectedly, it is also important to be realistic about what will occur in the absence of a more formalized structure. It may be difficult for stakeholders to have foresight about where conflict may arise due to their focused perspectives but the City, with its broader perspective and mandate to determine land use, is in a better position to assess and address potential conflicts before they become destructive. It may also be unrealistic to expect that institutions will undertake such measures as are suggested by Reardon, Lewinberg and others without a requirement or incentive to do so.

The City has already made commitments to housing in each of these neighbourhoods as discussed earlier in the paper. Therefore it would seem that sacrificing owner-occupied housing in favour of fulfilling institutional requirements is not in the City's interest. Due to the long-term impacts that land use conflict has on communities, there is a clear need for the City of Winnipeg to take a more active role, especially in low-income, inner-city neighbourhoods bordered by large institutions.

In cases where a strained relationship already exists, the City could act more directly as mediator. The City is also the best positioned to ensure there are procedures or regulations that address power imbalances between stakeholders. More proactively, if a framework to resolve conflict and build collaboration is available from the start, this may avoid the challenge of primarily personality-based conflicts. The City should play a key role in more clearly defining this framework. In cases where there are clear differences in scale, power and the understanding of what constitutes community between stakeholders, conflicts will not work themselves out; at minimum a set of guidelines that must be followed is necessary.

Guidelines and good practices are already available through the work of Reardon, Lewinberg and others, but it is only the City that is in the position to actively formalize them and

ensure they are followed. For example, the City could require that institutions work directly with neighbourhood associations on their institutional expansion plans through shared committees such as those proposed by Lewinberg. In this model, the City would have a seat on the committee, potentially with a role as mediator or observer as required by the situation. They could also be the ones to initiate a steering committee in the first place, particularly in low-income neighbourhoods where there are concerns about representation, with an eye to ensuring that collaborative planning is part of the process.

This activity is not beyond the City's reach. A foundation for representation for a steering committee approach as proposed by Lewinberg in the HSC case has been established through the stakeholder committee for the secondary plan process. Processes such as these ensure that neighbourhoods' futures are not entirely dependent upon the good will of individuals. Of course, individual actions and attitudes will have significant impact, but formalized processes and roles can ensure that there is a bare minimum of collaborative planning wherever it is required.

In cases where secondary plans are required, the City should seek to ensure all stakeholders are heard. Neighbourhood green plans and housing strategies should inform a secondary plan, just as institutional strategies, such as the UW campus renewal strategy might.

In Conclusion

This research does not suggest that conflict between residents and institutions should be ignored or made invisible. Instead, the findings support the notion that conflict is inevitable in situations where sticky capital and low-income communities meet. This dynamic should be embraced as a possibility for productive change rather than feared or allowed to completely characterize the relationship.

Community residents and institutions that share neighbourhoods need each other for their joint success. Just as institutions benefit from strong and healthy residential communities, so too can residents benefit from the enhancements that strong institutions can bring to a neighbourhood. Plans for community that do not sufficiently take into consideration the needs of residents or major institutions are bound to exacerbate conflict and distrust.

None of the institutions involved in these case studies demonstrate malice towards the communities they help shape. In the case of the UW, the institution has been very public about its desire to change the neighbourhood and has suggested that its plans for institutional expansion are part of a broader orientation toward community learning. It is certainly possible,

although by no means inevitable, that positive outcomes could emerge from this — for both community members and the University. The HSC has also already had significant impact on its neighbourhood. In its need for an expanded footprint, it has increased the pressures on residential housing but also has made efforts to improve its relationship with West Alexander residents. Balmoral Hall seems to have been caught off guard by the community's concerns about its tentative plan to expand its footprint and has subsequently retreated, selling off some of the property that had begun their land assembly efforts and stating they now do not intend to expand beyond their current footprint (BH interview: 2009). In every case senior administrators speak convincingly about their desires for the community and genuine interest in residents' concerns.

Institutions also need to acknowledge that there is a power imbalance that gives them a stronger voice in land use planning. As a result of this greater power, they also have a greater responsibility to ensure their actions do not harm the neighbourhood and that they establish decision-making processes that enhance the role of community. Institutions and community rep-

representatives need to have regular, joint sessions where concerns and kudos can be brought forward, whether during times of significant development or outside of those times. By implementing regular meetings, all involved can be confident that there is a legitimate forum for discussion. This structure can also facilitate defined roles and responsibilities whereby representatives have the clear authority to report back and speak on behalf of their respective constituencies. Ideally these joint sessions will have authority over recommendations, ensuring that both community and institutional representatives are a part of key discussions regarding land use.

The success of these joint entities requires strong supportive leadership from both the senior ranks of the institutions involved, and key community organizers. Where institutional representatives may be determined to some degree by job descriptions, neighbourhood representatives ideally would be appointed by community election or by virtue of their position as neighbourhood association staff. It is also necessary that parties approach this as an investment in long-term relationship development rather than an expectation of quick fixes. As Lewinberg suggests, it can be particularly valuable for communities to work together on a master plan. The master plan can become the physical expression of the vision for the community and the product of the shared and negotiated needs of the institution and neighbourhood. In order for that to happen, a functional (and representative) steering committee is essential.

Not all challenges can be anticipated, however, and there will always be discussions worth having outside of a committee setting. As a result, there is great value in having annual community meetings at which institutional members present and answer questions. As was the case at the community forum at the Ellice Street Theatre in February 2009 for the West Broadway and Spence neighbourhoods, all residents would be invited to attend and raise concerns

or questions; in turn institutions would commit to presenting and making time to answer questions. This willingness to meet would be a tangible indication that Balmoral Hall, the UW and the HSC understand that the communities they live in are key stakeholders in their activities. It may also provide an opportunity for disinformation to be allayed and rumours to be confirmed or denied.

The current challenge seems to be that there is a lack of process to follow, which the City could address by taking a leadership role in ensuring the power imbalance that exists between institutions and residents are addressed in the planning process. The City can strengthen expectations on what constitutes collaborative community planning through regulatory means. Citizens expect their governments to behave in the best interests of the community as a whole and regulations are one way to accomplish this.

There is a valuable role for government to play in ensuring that existing tools in place for land use planning are employed to their full extent and that there is an appropriate adherence to these plans once they are laid out. The City currently has the tools in place to ensure that land use planning takes the power imbalance between institutions and neighbourhoods into consideration, but these tools are only useful if employed. Secondary plans are still required for both Spence and West Broadway at a crucial point in the history of the development of these neighbourhoods. As the City seems to have a waiting list of requested secondary plans, institutions have too much latitude to make significant changes to land use without requirement for community collaboration. This requires both an administrative and political will that comes when residents and others insist that the City ensure land use planning is not overly focused on new development at the expense of the protection and preservation of existing and older neighbourhoods such as West Alexander, West Broadway and Spence.

While the role of government is essential, there is a great deal that can be done at the community level so the plans going forward for approval are more representative of the concerns of both residents and institutions. Communities and institutions need to engage each other in this challenging, and necessary, work of ongoing communication and joint planning to ensure that the plans that result reflect the best of both parties' abilities and interests. Large institutions

have significant power in inner-city communities because they provide significant economic and social benefits that are shared by the city at large and the province as a whole, but this should not mean that their expansion is unfettered. This paper suggests that institutions need to embrace their role as one part of multi-faceted inner-city neighbourhoods, and to bring their best to the table to work in tandem with community residents and their representatives.

Endnotes

- 1 City of Winnipeg Housing Policy (adopted 1999) can be viewed at: http://winnipeg.ca/ppd/planning_housing.stm.
- 2 <http://www.uwinnipeg.ca/index/future-about>. Accessed April 3, 2011 3:42 pm.
- 3 <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0008266>. Accessed April 3, 2011 10:40 am.
- 4 University of Winnipeg news release: April 14, 2005 "UWinnipeg Establishes Development Corporation To Aid in Campus/Downtown West Revitalization"
- 5 During the research of this paper I was a student at the University of Winnipeg as part of its Masters in Public Administration program, jointly administered with the University of Manitoba. I also served on the UW Board of Regents between 2008 and 2010 with a leave of absence during the primary data collection phase of this research.
- 6 <http://www.hsc.mb.ca/corporate/history.htm>
- 7 <http://www.hsc.mb.ca/corporate/default.htm>
- 8 'Kleysen name added to research facility' Winnipeg Free Press By: Staff Writer
- ? Posted: 09/14/2009 1:04 PM Accessed via: <http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/local/breakingnews/Kleysen-name-added-to-research-facility-59243717.html>
- 9 See the Planning Act available at <http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/po8oe.php> as well as Plan Winnipeg 3B-02ii, available at : http://www.winnipeg.ca/cao/pdfs/plan_2020.pdf
- 11 Spence Neighbourhood Community Plan 2006-2011 pg 35. March 2007.
- 12 Personal correspondence w/ WB representative (July 20, 2010)
- 13 This section is derived from my notes taken at the Pinkham school meeting.
- 14 See http://spenceneighbourhood.org/?page_id=340 for the SNA Housing Plan and Green Plan.
- 15 Source: Pg 31. President's Task Force on Athletics and Academics. Enhancing Excellence in Athletics and Academics (March/April 2009). Accessed via: <http://www.uwinnipeg.ca/index/community>. April 25, 2010. 2:25 PM.
- 16 Source: <http://www.uwinnipeg.ca/index/community>. Accessed 1:20 PM 29 May, 2010.
- 17 See www.seedwinnipeg.ca. for further information on CED principles and their application.
- 18 Subsequent to the research for this paper in 2009, relations between the hospital and the West Alexander community appear to have taken a turn for the worse with significant conflict about the new Women's Hospital, the Secondary Plan, and how the City is facilitating amendments. This is further evidence that the relationship between big institutions and low-income neighbourhoods is fraught with difficulty and requires consciously developed solutions.
- 19 In contrast, residents were pleased with the way the Virology Lab has handled their concerns and kept them informed of developments through a Citizens Advisory Committee which hosts annual community meetings and

information meetings during times of critical incidents. Committee members do not have the power to change the direction of the lab's future, but they do serve as an intermediary for the community in identifying concerns. This suggests that the Residents Association is not unwill-

ing to be supportive of development, but is also looking for some level of respect in the process. As a result this model could be used elsewhere for the campus in future.

20 See: http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/planning_secondary_adopted_WAlex.stm

Bibliography

- Balmoral Hall. Retrieved May 24, 2009, from http://www.balmoralhall.com/home/about_bh/bh-history
- Burley, David G. Burley and Mike Maunder (2008). *Living on Furby: Narratives of Home, Winnipeg, Manitoba 1880 – 2005*. Winnipeg: Winnipeg Inner-City Research Alliance/ Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg
- Canada, 2006 Census Data - Spence Neighbourhood Profile. Retrieved from:
- Carter, T. C. (2008). *The Housing Circumstances of Recently Arrived Refugees: The Winnipeg Experience*. Edmonton: Praire Metropolis Centre.
- CCPA – MB. (2008). *State of the Inner City Report 2008*. Winnipeg: CCPA-MB.
- Loxley, J. “The State of Community Economic Development in Winnipeg”, in J. Loxley, K. Sexmith and J. Silver (Eds.), *Doing Community Economic Development*. Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing and Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Manitoba.
- MacKinnon, S. “Housing in Manitoba” In S. MacKinnon and L. Fernandez (Eds.), *The Social Determinants of Health in Manitoba*. Winnipeg: CCPA- MB.
- Mahon, R., C.Andrew and R. Johnson. Policy Analysis in an Era of “Globalization”: Capturing Spacial Dimensions and Scalar Strategies from Orsini, M.and M. Smith. (2007) *Critical Policy Studies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Martin, D. G. (2004). “Reconstructing Urban Politics: Neighbourhood Activism in Land-Use Change” *Urban Affairs Review*, 39 (5).
- Maurasse, D.J. Maurasse (2001). *Beyond the Campus: How Colleges and Universities Form Partnerships with their Communities*. New York: Routledge.
- Reardon, K. M. (2000). “An Experiential Approach to Creating an Effective Community-University Partnership: The East St Louis Action Research Project.” *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5 (1), 59 - 74.
- Reardon, K. M. (2006). “Promoting Reciprocity within Community/University Development Partnerships: Lessons from the Field” *Planning, Practice & Research*, 21 (1), 95 - 107.
- Reardon, K. M. (2005). “Straight A’s: Evaluating the Success of Community/ University Development Partnerships” *Communities and Banking*. Summer, 3-10.

- Rubin, V. (2000). "Evaluating University-Community Partnerships: An Examination of the Evolution of Questions and Approaches" *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5 (1), 219 - 230.
- Sandercock, L. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: mongrel cities in the 21st century*. London; New York: Coninum.
- SEED Winnipeg. *CEd Principles (Criteria)*. Retrieved June 24, 2010, from SEED Winnipeg Inc. : www.seedwinnipeg.ca/ced.htm
- Shantz, Valerie. Notes on Frank Lewinberg presentation at Pinkham School to West Alexander residents.
- Silver, J., K. Sjoberg, and M. McCracken(2009). *Neighbourhood Renewal Corporations in Winnipeg's Inner City: Practical Activism in a Complex Environment*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Manitoba.
- Silver, J. (2006). *Gentrification in West Broadway? Contested Space in a Winnipeg Inner-City Neighbourhood*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives- Manitoba.
- Silver, J. (2010). "Segregated City: 100 Years of Poverty in Winnipeg" In P. Thomas and C. Brown (Eds.), *Manitoba Politics and Government: Issues, Institutions, Traditions*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Statistics Canada, (2008, 03 09). *Neighbourhood Profiles*. Retrieved June 2, 2010, from <http://winnipeg.ca/census/2006/Community Areas/ Downtown Neighbourhood Cluster/Neighbourhoods/Downtowneast>.
- Toews, O. (2008). "From Revitalization to Revaluation in the Spence Neighbourhood." In *State of the Inner City Report 2008* (pp. 64 - 109). Winnipeg, MB: CCCPA- Manitoba Division.
- University of Winnipeg. (2009). *Consolidated Financial Statements for the Year Ended March 31, 2009*. Winnipeg: UW.
- University of Winnipeg (press release) (April, 14, 2005). "UWinnipeg Establishes Development Corporation to Aid in Campus/Downtown West Revitalization." Winnipeg.
- Weivel, W and D. Perry. (Eds.) (2005). *The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Winnipeg. *West Alexander and Centennial Neighbourhoods Background Study* (2006 draft).
- Zuckerman, H., I. Karkavy. *Eds and Meds: Cities' Hidden Assets*. University of Pennsylvania Center for Community Partnerships. Washington: Brooking Institution.

In addition to the texts listed above, there were a number of websites also important to this research:

www.balmoralhall.com

<http://spenceneighbourhood.org>

<http://www.westbroadway.mb.ca>

<http://www.uwinnipeg.ca>

<http://winnipeg.ca/ppd/planning>