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Abstract

This research paper examines social sustainability strategies in green neighbourhoods and how they involve a negotiation and balance between social justice and neoliberal justification. Dockside Green a LEED- ND Platinum Certified neighbourhood in Victoria BC is used as a case study to investigate how social justice can be envisioned and enacted within a Triple Bottom Line approach to sustainable development. The study examines the social sustainability obligations that were set out at the onset of the project within the Master Development Agreement (2005); and the underlying factors within neoliberal policies, that affected social sustainability outcomes. The research is based on interviews, observations, newspaper articles and policy documents. The results of the study reveal that social justice is at risk of being sidelined in neighbourhood planning to cater for profitability and the competitiveness agenda.

Keywords: Social justice; green neighbourhoods; inclusion; urban sustainability; Dockside Green; neighbourhood development
Acknowledgements

This project would not have been possible without the help of many individuals.

I would like to acknowledge and thank Meg Holden my thesis supervisor for her continuous support during my research process. I would also like to thank her patience and compassion and imparting her expertise towards my research. I am grateful of the opportunity of working with her on some research projects which greatly enriched my educational experience. I could not have asked for a better supervisor for this project.

I would like to thank the SFU Urban Studies Faculty for their tremendous support during the program including – Peter V. Hall, Matt Hern, Tiffany Muller Myrdahl, Anthony Perl, Terri Evans, Karen Ferguson, and Karen Sawatzky. They each contributed not only to my successful completion but also to the positive experience at SFU.

I would also like to thank Rebecca Holt - external examiner and Peter V. Hall – secondary supervisor for their valuable comments, feedback and critique.

I would like to acknowledge Anise Ladha from the Research Commons who assisted in formatting my thesis and Nina Smart for her assistance during a literature search.

I would also like to acknowledge my colleagues at the urban studies program including – Rahil Adeli, Kate Elliot, Yida Lin, Steve Tornes, Camila Souza and Danielle De Vries – for the stimulating conversations and encouragement. I am also grateful for the opportunity to work with the Urban Studies Graduate Student Association during my studies.

Lastly, I would like to extend my personal thanks to David, Mutsa, Mufaro and my parents for their encouragement and support.
# Table of Contents

Approval .......................................................................................................................... ii  
Ethics Statement ............................................................................................................ iii  
Abstract.......................................................................................................................... iv  
Acknowledgements ......................................................................................................... v  
Table of Contents ........................................................................................................... vi  
List of Tables ................................................................................................................... viii  
List of Figures .................................................................................................................. ix  
List of Acronyms ............................................................................................................. x  

## Chapter 1. Introduction ............................................................................................... 1  
1.1. Background ............................................................................................................. 4  
1.2. Research question .................................................................................................. 9  
1.3. Significance of research ......................................................................................... 10  

## Chapter 2. Conceptual Framework and Literature Review ......................................... 12  
2.1. Urban sustainability ............................................................................................... 12  
2.1.1. Sustainable urban form ...................................................................................... 14  
2.1.2. Neighbourhoods as a means of achieving sustainability .................................... 14  
2.2. Neoliberalism and governance ............................................................................. 18  
2.2.1. Entrepreneurialism in urban governance ......................................................... 21  
2.3. Social sustainability .............................................................................................. 24  
2.3.1. Social sustainability approaches – theory and practice .................................... 25  
2.3.2. Conceptualization of social equity and justice .................................................. 27  
2.4. Implications of neoliberal policies for social justice at a neighbourhood scale ...... 31  
2.4.1. Housing ............................................................................................................ 32  
2.4.2. Public amenities ................................................................................................. 33  
2.5. Summary of the conceptual framework .................................................................. 36  

## Chapter 3. Research Design and Methodology ......................................................... 38  
3.1. Data collection ....................................................................................................... 38  
3.1.1. Documentation .................................................................................................. 38  
3.1.2. Interviews ......................................................................................................... 40  
3.1.3. Field observations ............................................................................................ 40  
3.2. Data analysis ......................................................................................................... 41  

## Chapter 4. Setting the context for Dockside Green .................................................... 43  
4.1. Background to development of Dockside Green .................................................... 43  
4.1.1. Early history and First Nations people .............................................................. 43  
4.1.2. Sale of Dockside Green for redevelopment ...................................................... 45  
4.1.3. The vision for Dockside Green ......................................................................... 51  
4.1.4. The development process of Dockside Green .................................................. 53  
4.2. Purchase agreement – MDA .................................................................................. 55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1.</td>
<td>Development obligations set out in the MDA</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2.</td>
<td>The Development/Amenity Schedule</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.</td>
<td>Impact of 2008 market downturn on development process</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.</td>
<td>Challenges associated with development of sustainable neighbourhoods</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1.</td>
<td>Evolution of sustainability</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2.</td>
<td>Complexity of the MDA (2005)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement/monitoring of the MDA (2005) obligations</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility of the MDA (2005)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.</td>
<td>Amendment of the MDA (2016)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.</td>
<td>Chapter summary</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 5. **Balancing neoliberal processes and social sustainability outcomes at Dockside Green**

5.1. Neoliberal strategies at Dockside Green

| 5.1.1. | Negotiation of public interest vs private interest | 83 |
| 5.1.2. | Place-marketing and competitiveness agenda | 84 |

5.2. Evaluation of social sustainability goals at Dockside Green

| 5.2.1. | Recognition/inclusion of First Nations | 88 |
| 5.2.2. | Affordable housing | 91 |
| 5.2.3. | Public amenities | 99 |
| 5.2.4. | Transportation strategies | 104 |

5.3. Chapter summary

Chapter 6. **Conclusion**

Bibliography

Appendix: Codes used for Analysis
List of Tables

Table 1: History of development of Dockside Green ........................................... 8
Table 2: Criteria for evaluating social sustainability at Dockside Green ............. 10
Table 3: Social dimensions of sustainable development ........................................ 26
Table 4: Dimensions of public spaces ................................................................. 35
Table 5: Comparison of characteristics of just city model and neoliberal models of neighbourhood development ................................................................. 36
Table 6: Documents analyzed ............................................................................. 39
Table 7: List of respondents ................................................................................. 40
Table 8: Schedule D: Dockside Green Amenity/ Development Schedule ............ 62
Table 9: Types of Affordable housing units at Dockside Green Phase 1 and 2 .... 92
## List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1:</td>
<td>Location of Dockside Green, City of Victoria</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2:</td>
<td>3 - Legged stool of sustainable transportation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3:</td>
<td>First Nations occupation of Songhees Reserve 1866 (now part of Vic West)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4:</td>
<td>Former land uses of the Docklands</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5:</td>
<td>Dockside Green Site Plan</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6:</td>
<td>The progress of development at Dockside Green</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7:</td>
<td>Place-marketing and educational signage at Dockside</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8:</td>
<td>Dockside Green Songhees Nation Totem Pole</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 9:</td>
<td>Dockside Green purchaser ages</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10:</td>
<td>Madrona: proposed affordable housing</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 11:</td>
<td>Madrona affordable housing</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 12:</td>
<td>Dockside Green Site</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 13:</td>
<td>Public spaces at Dockside Green</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 14:</td>
<td>Transportation related infrastructure at Dockside Green</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td>Canada Mortgage &amp; Housing Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoV</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM</td>
<td>Federation of Canadian Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMF</td>
<td>Green Municipal Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED-ND</td>
<td>Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design - Neighbourhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>Master Development Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBL</td>
<td>Triple bottom line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGBC</td>
<td>U.S. Green Building Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1. Introduction

Sustainable development has become a buzzword as increasing numbers of municipalities embark on a mission to create sustainable places. The Brundtland Commission (also known as the World Commission on Environment and Development (WECD) (1987: 43) defines sustainable development as “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. This definition implies a balance and equalizing in the attainment of economic, social and environmental objectives. Sustainable development is development which is ecologically viable, economically feasible and socially equitable. However, in neoliberal urban development, emphasis is placed on market-driven objectives which limit the attention paid to social sustainability (Curran & Hamilton, 2018).

Currently, urban areas are facing environmental crises as well as the consequences of social inequalities and injustices. To address these, they need to focus on social as well as environmental sustainability. As environmental consciousness has grown in the conduct of urban developments, there has not been an increase in the adoption of social sustainability in policy frameworks (Manzi et al., 2010). The notion of social sustainability refers to a society that is socially just, equal, without social exclusion and with a decent quality of life, or livelihood, for all (Koning, 2001:9). Currently, urban areas are facing environmental crises as well as the consequences of social inequalities and injustices. Within the North American context, development of the triple bottom line (TBL) conceptualization of sustainability has also gained prominence (Davidson, 2010). Davidson (2010) also reframed the debate on the social sustainability definition within the TBL literature. Davidson (2010) explains that within the TBL framework, the delineation of social sustainability is territorially normative, and sustainability is often framed through environmental concerns. Social sustainability is left with a weak and normative definition compared to the other TBL components i.e. environmental and economic.

According to Holden et al. (2019), urban policy makers also recognize that social sustainability cannot be overlooked in urban development. The issue of balance in sustainable development becomes one of how environmental concerns can be addressed without committing further social injustices or exacerbating inequalities. This
study focuses precisely on the degree to which sustainable development considers social justice and equality within neighbourhood planning and redevelopment processes.

In this regard, sustainable communities are envisioned as environs that are liveable, with quality vicinities that are environmentally healthy and that meet the needs of all current and future residents (McKenzie, 2004). In addition, they are characterized as being inclusive, safe and sensitive to the environment. These parameters have generated ongoing discussion concerning ideal policies and approaches to the design and development of sustainable neighbourhoods. The aim is to generalize design planning strategies and conceptualization of methods and techniques, including those related to architectural structures, landscaping, mobility mechanisms and infrastructures concerned with enhancing living conditions in a sustainable manner. These instruments and mechanisms are encoded within the LEED-ND (LEED for Neighbourhoods) framework from the USGBC, that provides specific criteria by which the environment surrounding a new sustainable neighbourhood, including its infrastructure and its purported social and economic impact can be assessed and certified. In this way, just as LEED is a popular family of tools by which to certify what constitute “green” building, LEED-ND can be used as a means of advancing sustainability at the neighbourhood scale. Often assumed, the corollary assumption is that these efforts will consequently generate a socially inclusive and diverse neighbourhood.

Social sustainability is integral to urban policy and has increasingly become incorporated in urban policy and development (Shirazi and Keivani, 2019). However, while the organization of land use has been led by the public sector, cities are using market mechanisms to achieve public goals with minimal state intervention (OECD, 2007). These initiatives are conducted within the neoliberal framework, which endorses market-driven approaches such as privatization, individualism, deregulation, and entrepreneurialism. As the orchestrators of sustainable urban strategies and development projects are disproportionately investing in urban spaces and environs, attempts to reconcile social justice imperatives and neoliberal approaches result in tensions (Rosol et al, 2017).

This notion forms the basis of the current study in that social justice concerns are often side-lined and subjugated to neoliberal policies in neighbourhood planning in order to cater for profitability, economic growth and the competitiveness agenda. This thesis
recognizes the processes of neoliberal integration in the discourse of sustainability and the impact on the social outcomes of sustainability. As a basis for the analysis, it is necessary to consider how the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods is approached and achieved. Green or sustainable neighbourhoods\(^1\) are a recent phenomenon which emerged in the early 2000s and which have continually gained momentum as a goal of urban development. This reflects the growing concern about rapid urbanization and about climate change. In this respect, sustainable urban developments are regarded as a solution to address the challenges that are currently faced.

Local government plays a crucial role in promoting sustainable development at the neighbourhood scale. Whereas this role has traditionally been considered to take shape in powers such as taxation, regulation, planning and enforcement, it is argued firstly that local governments now play an equally important role in the way in which sustainable development is operationalized through various neoliberal strategies or market based approaches such as the promotion of innovation, a competitiveness agenda, use of incentives and deregulation. These are used as a form of guidance and monitoring process for urban development projects. Secondly, local governments support visions of sustainable development when they advocate for, enable and implement new urbanist style\(^2\) neighbourhood planning and landscape architecture (Trudeau, 2013). These visions for sustainable development are often outlined in the official community plan documents within the neighbourhood context.

The above suggests that social factors within sustainable neighbourhoods need to be considered. Holden (2011) adds that in order to address these issues, the challenges associated with urban economic and governance systems, as well as development inequities which include lack of access to quality public service and affordable housing, have contributed to the need for social sustainability in policy frameworks. For green neighbourhoods to be justly sustainable, the promotion of inclusion and equity should be considered as non-negotiable – a position which often

---

\(^1\) Green neighbourhoods are broadly defined as being moderately dense, mixed-use, designed at a human scale, promoting active transportation including walkability and connectivity; with green infrastructure and conservation of energy and water (Tam, Karimipour, & Wang, 2018; Ahmad, Misni, Kamaruddin & Daud:2017)

\(^2\) New urbanism principles are characterized by compact development, walkable blocks and streets, housing and shopping in close proximity, mixed land uses and accessible public spaces (CNU, 2000).
conflicts with a neoliberal agenda. Thus, policies and strategies should be implemented to ensure a balance between environmental, inclusive and just strategies.

The focus of the research is on Dockside Green in Victoria, British Columbia was promoted as a model sustainable neighbourhood development. Planned and developed via transformational and innovative approaches to sustainability, the development process at the same time reflects the implementation of a neoliberal governance agenda. The neighbourhood is located on a former industrial and brownfield site. The land was sold by the City of Victoria (CoV) to private developers and, as part of the purchase agreement, a Master Development Agreement (MDA) was signed in 2002 between the CoV and the developers, Windmill and Vancity, explicitly setting out social justice goals and strategies. The MDA clearly states that:

The parties wish to set out in this Agreement their agreement as to the manner in which the Dockside Lands will be developed, including provision and construction of certain Amenities by the Developer, the Developer’s obligation to provide affordable housing .... and the phased development of the Dockside Lands, following adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw and the Design Guidelines. (MDA, 2005: 2)

Dockside Green is a suitable case study of social justice in green neighbourhoods as it highlights how the implementation of neoliberal strategies has an impact on social justice. Dockside Green, Victoria was able to achieve the highest qualification for sustainability based on the LEED-ND certification system. Even though the development of the neighbourhood has been successful in creating an environmentally high quality and liveable community for its residents, it has been less successful in achieving social sustainability – the attainment of an equitable, diverse and inclusive social context (Barron & Gauntlet, 2002). For the most part the study uses physical characteristics of urban sustainability to identify areas in which development planning interventions affect social sustainability. Physical characteristics provide the fundamentals of societal structure and community setting that contribute to the decrease of social injustices and encourage healthy sustainable neighbourhoods.

1.1. Background

Dockside Green is a formerly city-owned property located in the Victoria West neighbourhood in the downtown City of Victoria (see Figure 1). It is a case study of a green neighbourhood development. The neighbourhood is on 6.1 ha of former dockland
that is being transformed into one of the most innovative green developments in the world. This case study will be used to highlight how, under the auspices of sustainability commitments, land use and neighbourhood planning are being pursued via a market-based approach at the local level in the implementation of sustainability.

The Dockside Green development received a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) ND (Neighbourhood scale) Platinum-level certification both in the pilot stage of LEED ND in 2008 and again for its updated neighbourhood plan in LEED ND v4 (Plan). In Canada, Southeast False Creek Neighbourhood is the only other project certified at the Platinum level. Dockside Green has also won several awards for its innovative approach to sustainability. These are: (i) 2006 Smart Growth BC award, (ii) 2006 National architectural award, (iii) 2008 GLOBE Awards for Environmental Excellence, (iv) Special Jury Award from AIBC Architectural Awards in 2009, (v) Top Ten Green Projects from the American Institute of Architects/Committee on the Environment in 2009, and (vi) Sustainable Community Brownfield Award from FCM-CH2MHill Sustainable Community Awards in 2009. These awards highlight the project’s commitment to, and recognition of, sustainable development (Windmill, n.d.).

---

3 LEED is an internationally recognized green building/community certification system created by the US Green Building Council and is recognized as a symbol for achievement in sustainable built form. It is a third-party verification system aimed at improving performance metrics including water efficiency, energy savings, reduction in CO₂ emissions, and improved indoor environmental quality. It is based on a categorization of qualitative and quantitative criteria for credit or points scoring assessment to achieve certification – the highest being Platinum (80+ points) (USBC, unknown).
Dockside Green was the first sustainable development project initiated by the CoV and demonstrates how the city developed policies and programs that encourage and support innovative green construction and neighbourhhood-scale planning and design. In the case of Dockside Green, the city adopted what they called a triple bottom line (TBL) accounting framework that integrates three dimensions of performance, namely, social, environmental and financial (Elkington, 1998). This approach was used
in the tendering process for potential developers via a Request for Proposals. This provided some flexibility to the developer to counterbalance a lower bid for the land, with social and environmental benefits in the form of site remediation, proposed land use and urban design.

Vancity and Windmill won the bid to develop Dockside Green in preference over Westbank Projects Corp due to its sustainable and innovative proposal. This envisaged the development of a pioneering sustainable neighbourhood adhering to LEED principles, to innovative remediation strategies and to the inclusion of on-site wastewater treatment and a biomass gasification system. According to Joe Van Belleghem, lead Windmill partner and promoter of the neighbourhood sustainability vision, Dockside Green “will be a model for how communities can contribute to meeting Kyoto targets” (Vancity, 2004).

The developers of Dockside Green adopted the following triple bottom line principles:

• Environmental: enhance and maintain the ecological health of the community, using different initiatives such as on-site wastewater treatment, renewable energy, water conservation, energy conservation, and compliance with the LEED-ND framework.

• Economic: build a neighbourhood that supports and grows the local economy and provides opportunities for work.

• Social: provide opportunities for inclusion and connectedness among the community’s neighbours (CAGBC, n.d.).

The above values highlight the commitment of Dockside Green to a sustainable approach. However, the challenge comes in integrating all the pillars of sustainability for the neighbourhood to become truly sustainable. In this respect, a discrepancy has been observed in the interpretation and implementation of the environmental and the socio-economic pillars (Ling et al., 2007).

\[\text{The Kyoto Protocol, which is part of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC), commits developed countries to set targets to reduce greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride). In Canada, the Kyoto target was set at 6% total GHG emissions reduction by 2012, compared to 1990 levels.}\]
In considering the sustainable development of Dockside Green, it is important also to trace the history of the site. Table 1 provides a summary of how Dockside Green has progressed from its inception.

### Table 1: History of development of Dockside Green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>The City of Victoria buys the brownfield site from the Province for $1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 (SEPT)</td>
<td>RFP sent out to pre-qualified developers; project awarded to Windmill and Vancity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Master Development Agreement (MDA) signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase of Docklands for $8.5 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Construction of Phase 1 (Synergy) begins construction (6 phases are planned in total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Economic downturn has adverse effect on development sector in BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bankruptcy and withdrawal of Windmill West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1-Synergy completed and awarded LEED NC Platinum (highest point score of any certified project in the world)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project awarded LEED-ND pilot phase platinum certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Phase 2 (referred to as ‘Balance’ comprised of 2 towers with 171 suites) completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pause/temporary stop in development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>‘Balance’ awarded LEED NC Platinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (SUMMER)</td>
<td>Construction begins for affordable housing (‘Madrona’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Construction of ‘Madrona’ complete (49 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OCT)</td>
<td>Announcement of purchase of Dockside Green by Bosa Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEC)</td>
<td>Rezoned and revised project awarded LEED-ND v4 (Plan) Platinum Certification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, the site has 266 residential units and is 25% complete. It is expected to be completed in 2027. Notably, the site has an onsite wastewater treatment plant, a greywater recycling system and a district energy facility that generates heat for the entire development. Despite the apparent success in the environmental sustainability of Dockside Green and the several awards it has garnered, the social aspect of
sustainability has not been extensively documented and considered. Different researchers, including Ling et al. (2007) and Dale and Newman (2009), have alluded to the fact that the social sustainability component has not met expectations. In keeping with their findings, the present case study highlights how sustainability initiatives stress the technological, environmental and economic aspects while understating the social dimension. Hence, the aim of this study is to explore the results of the efforts to produce social .and environmental sustainability on site.

1.2. Research question

The research questions that guide the research are:

1. How do the social sustainability strategies and results apparent at Dockside Green reflect a negotiation and balance between social justice and neo-liberal justifications for green neighbourhoods?

2. How does Dockside Green currently define, envision and interpret social dimensions of sustainability?

The aim of this study is to look at how neoliberal policies can be implemented in the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods without compromising the social dimensions of sustainability. The social aspects of sustainability are framed using the ‘just city’ principles, as substantiated by Fainstein (2010). The emphasis of this study is on social sustainability relating to accessibility and to activities explicitly focusing on equity, namely the fair and equitable distribution of impacts, including benefits, disadvantages and costs (Dempsey, Brown & Bramley, 2012). Therefore, this research highlights how social sustainability has emerged in a particular case. More specifically, it highlights the social status of the area, accessibility and the kinds of activities that are currently feasible.

According to the Dockside Green (2019) social sustainability statement published on its website, “Dockside Green is committed to building a neighbourhood where citizens can gather, find fresh food, places to play and create, and can easily access downtown and the surrounding neighbourhoods”. In addition, Dockside Green aspires to be a diverse and inclusive neighbourhood as well as to encourage a sense of community. The evaluation criteria set out in Table 2 illustrate the way in which social sustainability statements and outcomes will be assessed.
Table 2: Criteria for evaluating social sustainability at Dockside Green

Adapted from Dempsey et al. (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Urban social sustainability factors (physical and non-physical factors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Activities (Social and economic)</td>
<td>Contribution to a sense of belonging/sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of social Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics of public spaces available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities within neighbourhood (social gatherings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of small local business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Accessibility</td>
<td>Transport-related social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., to local services and facilities/employment/green space)</td>
<td>Transport options provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of public transportation, cycling infrastructure and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walkability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porosity of boundaries between districts, including the downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheelchair access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Social mix</td>
<td>Diversity of population - age and ethnicity including those living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of affordable housing vs. market housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Places to play and be creative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3. Significance of research

At the time of writing, numerous urban initiatives were being advanced to make cities greener. These initiatives present opportunities to analyse the relationship between the built environment and the social life of communities. As developers, designers and planners are acknowledging that green innovation needs to apply at the neighbourhood level, opportunities are created for the implementation of sustainability at a local scale. Dockside Green is a precedent to approaches to green development that can be used in other neighbourhood developments.

Further, in the course of development planning, it is often the case that little attention is placed on how to ensure maximum benefits for society from sustainability-oriented developments. Therefore, Dockside Green may provide lessons for other developers seeking guidance on how to achieve social sustainability in a neighbourhood development for an equitable and inclusive society.

This thesis commences from the notion that any infrastructural development has the potential to influence social sustainability. My approach is to identify some of the ways in which development projects impact the social lives and environments of people.
By identifying relevant components of social sustainability and how to better implement social sustainability at a neighbourhood level, stakeholders such as developers, local government and city planners are better equipped to achieve social sustainability outcomes.

In summary, this study is relevant to the field of urban studies because it offers some insight into how neighbourhood-scale built environment development can be implemented in such a manner as to ensure that equity and inclusion are incorporated. The aim should be that planners can ensure positive social outcomes, while at the same time mitigating any adverse social outcomes. This study helps firstly to establish what is fundamental for a practical approach to ensuring maximum social well-being, and secondly to build on the existing literature on sustainability in a neighbourhood. This research will be valuable to green designers, developers, social planners and policymakers in local government in their attempts to develop a practical approach for project developers and implementers to use in creating social sustainability. Consequently, this can offer an opportunity for improvement in community outcomes.

This thesis highlights the interplay of neoliberal urban policies and social sustainability initiatives and suggests how these can be negotiated in green neighbourhoods to create a socially sustainable community. Dockside Green provides a basis for studying social sustainability within the urban policy context and analyzing the challenges that are often found in the implementation of the social aspects of sustainability at a neighbourhood scale.
Chapter 2. Conceptual Framework and Literature Review

The purpose of this literature review is to provide a comprehensive summary of previous research on the topic of urban social sustainability. To answer the research questions, the research is grounded in a critical analysis of neoliberal policies and an assessment of social justice outcomes within urban green neighbourhoods. Tying relevant theoretical ideas into a conceptual framework provides a basis of analysis for the study. The literature review serves as a basis for contextualizing this research within the milieu of Dockside Green, Victoria, BC.

The literature review is divided into three sections. The first section analyzes urban sustainability and how green neighbourhoods are framed within the broader field of urban development study. The second section considers neoliberal policies and how these policy approaches shape sustainable initiatives. The last section examines social sustainability and explicitly focuses on the ‘just city’, as conceptualized by Fainstein (2010).

2.1. Urban sustainability

Sustainable development strategies have become part of ambitious municipal plans to create sustainable and liveable cities. Sustainable development comprises three main pillars – economic sustainability, environmental protection and social sustainability (WCED, 1987). In an ideal world, the sustainability framework seeks to balance all the pillars of sustainability. As highlighted in several studies, the environmental components of sustainability have garnered more attention than the social and economic pillars (Boström, 2012). Boström (2012) stated that obstacles that hinder social sustainability are due to the fact that social sustainability is a fluid concept, and in addition concern arises on how to incorporate and operationalize it within sustainable development. Still, the imbalance in the application and adoption of sustainability as a set of three pillars is of equal importance.

In the development of urban sustainable communities, the incorporation of strategies that ensure social equity has become critical. The focus of social equity is on people and quality of social life. Social sustainability is complex, multifaceted and often
not easy to define or quantify, and is therefore often neglected. As a result, its role in the achievement of urban sustainability becomes problematic.

The integration of global frameworks with current planning frameworks at specific localities can support and enhance local sustainability priorities and outcomes for local governments. From the 1990s, awareness of sustainability grew and led to the formation of different sustainability commissions and national bodies (Turcu, 2013). Within the international space, global frameworks of sustainability have been developed to provide harmonization and common ground for global sustainability goals. These impose specific, easily measurable and discernible objectives that can be monitored to measure progress towards meeting sustainable development goals.

The UN Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 ushered in an era where sustainability strategies were incorporated into the public policy sphere (UNCED, 1992). An outcome of the summit was Local Agenda 21, the first global action plan to encourage sustainability at a local level by local governments. Additionally, it provided a basis for sustainable land use and development which also encouraged the integration of environmental concerns. In Canada, the federal government implemented the Accord on Environmental Harmonization in 1998 (CCME, 1998). This minimized the federal government role in environmental regulation and increased the role of local government in environmental matters. Thus, municipalities emerged as sustainability and climate action leaders, investing in policies and infrastructure that contributed to sustainability.

The sustainability model has been replicated and applied to different geographical locations, contexts and economies. In the course of this, there have been different interpretations of the framework. Even though the best practice approaches for sustainable development have been promoted in international platforms, little evidence is available to contest the value of these approaches and the impacts and the implications of adopting some of these best practices (Bulkeley, 2006).

This highlights the efforts to promote sustainable development on a global scale which have also been made by the government. The global frameworks also provide a set of targets that national governments can set as priorities based on their regional context. This provides a foundation on which national governments can encourage sustainability at both a national and local level.
2.1.1. Sustainable urban form

As environmental concerns increase, along with the realization that urban settlements produce the most significant environmental footprint, regional and local governments in cities are of prime importance in achieving sustainability planning (Ahmad, Misni, Kamaruddin & Daud, 2017). At the time of writing, several urban initiatives are being put forward to make cities greener, healthier and eco-friendlier. In recent years most cities are engaged in pursuing sustainability (Ahmad, Misni, Kamaruddin & Daud, 2017: 2). Achieving the sustainable city also demands that its constituent parts foster sustainability (Luederitz, Lang & Von Wehrden, 2013). Therefore, it is important to highlight how urban form contributes to the attainment of sustainability outcomes.

At a local level and community scale of development, neighbourhood developers and planners are increasingly interested in integrating sustainable initiatives and principles in neighbourhood planning and development (Wheeler, 2004; Sharifi, 2016). Neighbourhood communities are also able to respond to many of the challenges that are faced within their particular context and are in a unique position to reveal interactions between existing strategies within the city and supporting initiatives that the city might choose to implement (Holden et al., 2015). Neighbourhood locales provide an ideal urban form which has substantial potential to improve the wider environment and also to impact positively on socioeconomic factors including inclusive communities, safety, community well-being and affordable housing (Sharifi & Murayama, 2014). In addition, sustainable neighbourhoods or districts provide test beds for sustainable development. Thus, they can also set standards for sustainability in the broader context of the city.

2.1.2. Neighbourhoods as a means of achieving sustainability

Neighbourhoods are considered districts or spaces within the urban setting. According to Galster (2001, 2112), a neighbourhood is “the bundle of spatially based attributes associated with clusters of residences, sometimes in conjunction with other land uses”. As a spatial construct, a neighbourhood is regarded as a “residential or mixed-use area around which people can conveniently walk” (Barton, 2013:5). As a social construct, a neighbourhood is a community where different individuals live and create a network based on their shared location. Within the rhetoric of sustainable
development, a neighbourhood is presented as an effective scale for intervention because proponents claim that this scale renders feasible the introduction of new ideas and technologies for sustainability. They provide locations for the development of replications to be employed by cities at a broader scale, and also in other areas (Rosado, Hagy, Kalmykova, Morrison & Ostermeyer, 2015).

The concept of neighbourhoods has also evolved over time to include sustainability initiatives. From the early 1990s, there has been an increasing demand for sustainable residential environments and new planning models have emerged to cater for the demand (Lee & Park, 2018). The English government’s sustainable communities plan (ODPM, 2005:7) highlights the people-centric approach in sustainable urban planning in its definition of the sustainable neighbourhood. Sustainable neighbourhoods are defined as:

places where people want to live and work, now and in the future. They meet the diverse needs of existing and future residents, are sensitive to their environment, and contribute to a high quality of life. They are safe and inclusive, well planned, built and run, and offer equality of opportunity and good services for all.

Although green neighbourhoods are supposed to be guided mainly by the core elements of sustainability – social, environmental, and economic factors – there exist broad and varied policies and evaluation processes due to different neighbourhood contexts. Hence the design for green neighbourhoods may be used as a response to specific local needs such as energy efficiency, inclusive design or active transportation (Chastenet et al., 2016; Holden & Li, 2014). Ruano’s 1998 defines eco-urbanism as “the development of multi-dimensional sustainable human communities within harmonious and balanced built environments”. The definition indicates that there are implications for the environment and therefore it is vital for it to be considered in urban planning. Eco-urbanism has recently had some appeal across different global contexts, and has become a dominant movement that has propagated neighbourhood/district scale work for sustainability worldwide (Sharifi & Murayama, 2014).

Neighbourhoods provide “pockets within a city for sustainable development” (Rosado et al., 2015). Though the development of sustainable neighbourhoods is characterized by greater financial risk and complexity compared to traditional developments, sustainable developments promote energy and water efficiency that
lower the cost of services (FCM, 2016). In addition, there are improved amenities consisting of green spaces and more sustainable modes of transportation. These developments appeal to environmentally conscious individuals and businesses (FCM, 2016).

According to Sharifi and Murayama (2014), the process of neighbourhood planning has been influenced by market mechanisms. In addressing sustainability requirements at the neighbourhood level, there has been an emergence of neighbourhood voluntary/third-party sustainability rating certifications systems such as LEED-ND (LEED for Neighbourhood Development). The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) green building rating system is the most widely utilized rating tool for new and existing buildings, commercial interiors and neighbourhood development (Sharifi & Murayama 2014). LEED was first introduced to the market in 2000 and is managed by the United States Green Building Council (USGBC). Market-based and voluntary rating systems are not enough to realize sustainable development, although they offer a foundation for gauging sustainability (Sharifi & Murayama, 2013).

LEED has become the most recognized standard around the world and more organizations are adopting it so as to acquire a ‘brand recognition’ in order to be competitive in the global market (Cole and Jose Valdebenito, 2013). In addition, LEED certification of any project is used as a marketing tool and thus developers are motivated to obtain LEED certification (Matisoff et al, 2014). Such private sector-led third-party sustainability rating tools ensure a competitive approach to provisioning sustainable neighbourhoods by developers.

LEED–ND and eco-urban developments have been criticized for prioritising the economic pillar of sustainability and undervaluing the other pillars of sustainability. According to Sharifi and Murayama (2014), sustainable neighbourhoods have been unsuccessful in meeting the social sustainability criteria relating to inclusiveness – or including marginalized individuals – due to the market logic of efficiency prioritization. This is contrary to the justice goals by which public services are intended to be distributed and allocated. Therefore, the prioritization of market led policies, which include privatization and competitive agenda, undermine the role of the state in safeguarding the public interest.
Sustainable transportation options are also critical within neighbourhoods. Schiller and Kenworthy (2018: 2) highlighted that sustainable transportation “aims at promoting better and healthier ways of meeting individual and community needs while reducing the social and environmental impacts of current mobility practices”. Sustainable transportation initiatives are underpinned by devising strategies and are also linked to a sustainable urban design that promotes healthier communities. Sustainable transportation options connect neighbourhoods to the surrounding city and link them to key activities such as employment. These links make sustainable transportation dimensions key to the social equity debate (Lucas et al., 2010). In considering equity in transportation, a dependency on automobiles might disadvantage those without cars and thus it is critical to have an environment or infrastructure that supports alternative modes of transportation for everyone. In this regard, Schiller and Kenworthy (2018) provided the 3-Legged stool of sustainable transportation shown in Figure 2. This consists of pedestrianism (encouraging pedestrian friendly networks), bicycling and public transportation. These alternative transportation modes also contribute to social equity, thus facilitating mobility for all backgrounds irrespective of socio-economic background (Tumlin, 2012; Schiller & Kenworthy, 2018).

![Figure 2: 3-Legged stool of sustainable transportation](source: Schiller & Kenworthy (2018))

In summary, in the discourse of sustainable urban development, aspects of social justice, inclusiveness and diversity have often been overshadowed by work that panders to ‘mainstream’ green economic thinking and environmental protection within the competitive and economic growth agenda. The following section highlights the neoliberal process of governance.
2.2. Neoliberalism and governance

In this section of the literature review, I analyse the discourse on neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is described as a model of governance based on the extension of market forces in society. The definition of neoliberalism given by Harvey (2007: 22) is “a theory of political, economic practices proposing that human well-being can best be advanced by the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterized by private property rights, individual liberty, unencumbered markets and free trade”. Ong (2006: 6) defined neoliberal government as “government of free individuals who are then induced to self-manage according to market principles of discipline, efficiency and effectiveness.”

Neoliberalism is understood as an ideology and practice privileging efficiency and profit-driven growth over policies of social justice. Human competition is regarded as the dominant human characteristic. In the planning of cities, citizens are reconfigured as consumers who exercise their buying power in the marketplace, where efficiency is rewarded, and inefficiency penalized. In recent years, the political and economic ideologies of neoliberalism have become embedded in public policy as there has been a shift from publicly planned solutions to market-oriented ones (Sager, 2011). Therefore, for the purposes of this study, neoliberalism provides an outline for framing the economic policies which are part of a regulatory strategy used at the local-city level (Brand & Thomas, 2005).

Neoliberalism is a complex phenomenon that has been adapted to diverse theoretical conceptualizations and disciplinary contexts. The term emerged in the year 1898 within the free market context. Prior to 1980, neoliberalism was a scarcely utilized esoteric term. Subsequently, it was mostly used by economists. More recently, the term has been adapted and now is used commonly in the social sciences. The works of Marx and Foucault have influenced how the term has been redefined (Cotoi, 2011). The term has become more geared towards power and ideology, and the relationship between the state and market mechanisms. It is also used to highlight the shift in the state in provision of public welfare to the promotion of the market-oriented approach.

Research in neoliberal urbanism also emphasizes the changes in the role of the state in urban government. In this instance, Peck and Tickell (2002) outlined the
mechanisms which have evolved over time in the different forms of neoliberal processes. The first phase is ‘roll-back’ which was mostly employed in the UK and USA in the 1970s and 1980s. The rolling back referred to the previously existing idea of government-market dynamics known as Keynesianism or the welfare state. Government acted to provide public and social goods that the private market was not well suited to provide and collected taxes in order to pay for these social and public goods (Peck & Tickell, 2002). Following the roll-back of the welfare state, the second phase of neoliberal takeover of market-state relationships is the ‘roll-out’ i.e. “the purposeful construction and consolidation of neoliberalized state forms, modes of governance, and regulatory relations” (Peck and Tickell, 2002, 384). The roll-out was implemented as the negative impacts of the neoliberal measures began to make the market inefficient. Neoliberal ideology changed in the roll-out phase, which includes the departure from prior governmental control and state regulations and fosters community. Within the roll-back process, the state’s economic freedom is promoted, and within urban development these are sold and marketed for free enterprise (Peck and Tickell, 2002).

The current research is framed in terms of the roll-out processes, which also involve the urban entrepreneurial modes of governance proposed by Harvey (2009). The main aim of roll-out neoliberalism is to deepen neoliberal policies by introducing new forms of institution building and governmentalities referred to as "the techniques and strategies by which a society is rendered governable (Foucault, 1997). The roll-out phase also adopts a more social interventionist agenda embracing notions such as community regeneration and welfare reform, which had been neglected in the roll-back phase. Peck and Tickell (2002) emphasize that in the roll-out phase, new knowledge bases and discourses of government are planned and rolled-out, with the government assuming a more active role in enabling competitiveness strategies through supporting and guiding urban development projects and urban infrastructure. In following this, local governments impose planning obligations on developers which can be used in delivering physical infrastructure (Marsh, 2010). These planning obligations have become a public value capture tool which is used to determine and incorporate social and environmental costs through market-oriented mechanisms. In line with their market orientation, neoliberal government strategies emphasize entrepreneurialism. Urban entrepreneurialism as a form of roll-out neoliberal governance provides a basis of
analysis that is used to evaluate socio-political conditions in urban settings. This activity is underlined by risk-taking, and motivated by profit and economic growth (OECD, 2007).

Recently, there has been more research on the political economy, market-oriented reform policies and escalation of facilitative government action, otherwise envisaged as the role of government as an “enabling government” rather than a “providing government” (Healey, 1997). Effectively, facilitative government involves mobilization of negotiative networks with the private sector. Political influences emerge as sustainability is introduced by the state as a new mode of regulation, with the aim of combining and managing both marketization and its costs (Peck & Tickell, 2007). As a consequence, there has been a shift to more self-regulation, public-private co-operation and the “neo-corporatist regulatory frameworks involving non-binding standards and rules” (McCarthy & Prudham, 2004:276).

In the context of government policy, neoliberalism supports market-based solutions to social problems. In the urban development process, public-sector services are decentralized, and there is an increase in the engagement of different stakeholders (including private corporations, public agencies and public-private partnerships). Thus, there are new roles in the relationship between the private and the public sector whereby the state relies on the private sector for the delivery of public services. In this scenario, the non-state players become critical players in urban development by promoting consumerism, entrepreneurialism and property-led development. Harvey (1989,7) also explained that “the new entrepreneurialism has as its centrepiece the notion of public-private partnership in which a traditional local boosterism is integrated with the use of local governmental powers to try and attract external sources of funding, new direct investments or new employment sources”. This not only represents a local economic policy but also a shift in urban governance. Short et al. (1998) also provided an analysis for the restructuring of contemporary American cities whereby there is a streamlining of the city to attract capital as a means of civic boosterism, and a revitalization of the neighbourhood. This includes “reorienting a city’s relationship with its physical environment” (Short et al, 2009: 207). This creates a positive picture which is used in the city’s marketing.

In summary, neoliberal urban development policy in relation to sustainable development entails (i) the competitiveness requisite of a clean-green city image to draw
investment; and (ii) a city’s commitment to supporting and finding solutions to global ecological concerns by the assumption of sustainable development initiatives. In addition to this, there is the reconfiguration of the role of the city in terms of (iii) restructuring local government, characterized by tight fiscal controls over local authority spending; (iv) initiation of management practices which emulate or derive from the private sector; (v) the advent of the city as a critical spatial scale in the global economy; and (vi) emergence of competitiveness as the most significant principle of economic development (Brand & Thomas, 2005).

2.2.1. Entrepreneurialism in urban governance

Entrepreneurialism in urban governance has shifted to spatial scales i.e. local neighbourhood and community and increasing importance on urban competitiveness, and economic growth (Harvey, 1989). Green governmentality is part of the re-framing of the limits bordered by public and private responsibility, with the citizen as client and customer (Keil, 2002). Within sustainable development discourse, neoliberal policies form part of the city’s entrepreneurial strategy, based on the integration of states and financial markets in the financing of new urban and infrastructure projects (Harvey, 2012). Therefore, green governmentality also stresses the balance between the economic aspects of sustainability – urban entrepreneurialism and adaptation to climate change – which are the driving forces behind the creation of policies and strategies that support cities.

Local government, alongside the private sector, often takes the lead role in setting the vision for sustainable development through different persuasive marketing strategies such as photographic, written, video and presentations (Caprotti, Springer & Harmer, 2015). These strategies also allude to economic imperatives. According to Foucault (2008), competition and market-led strategies become a goal of governmental art, which is produced by an active governmentality. Emphasis is placed on the green branding of cities, which is regarded as a mechanism to enhance liveability, competitiveness and governance of urban environments (Jessop, 1997). Strategies that are geared towards ‘imagineering’ and ‘re-branding’ or changing negative imaginings, such as former industrial sites being transformed into attractive spaces for housing developments and recreational facilities, have been widely used to redefine urban spaces (OECD, 2007). More broadly, there exist economic and profitability influences
whereby marketing and promotion of a sustainable vision for an urban development is intended to lure prospective investors and residents.

Research highlights that entrepreneurialism is used to describe distinctive changes in the neoliberal city governance and government which are proactively engaged in stimulating economic growth. This also highlights how cities are adapting to increased global competition (Jessop, 1998; Hall & Hubbard, 1996). More cities have been implementing entrepreneurialism. Manchester has been used widely as a case study that reveals how the eco-neighbourhood project became an integral element of competitiveness and entrepreneurial urban policies (Paddison, 1993). Within the sustainable urban agenda, the Greening Manchester program was set up to ensure that Manchester would become the greenest city in Britain. This case study also shows a roll-out phase where government intervened by supporting and funding the sustainability strategy in urban projects.

In addition, the literature has also focused on the role of flagship developments with policy approaches being tried and tested within urban neoliberal development (Smyth, 2005). Flagship developments are consequently used for place branding by highlighting local distinctiveness and also to provide a ‘signature’ that is used in city promotion. The use of physical infrastructure has also become part of the branding and place marketing agenda, being an important feature in place marketing – a practice of applying marketing and branding strategies to cities (Smyth, 2005). This is essential as it ensures that the developments are economically viable according to a neoliberal logic. However, this once again highlights the unbalanced nature of the three pillars of sustainability in that sustainability is concentrating on the environmental and the economic pillars that encourage sustainable infrastructure and place marketing (Caprotti et al., 2015).

Whereas national governments have produced macroeconomic policies that take a neoliberal perspective on the broader scale, municipalities have been tasked with managing and regulating ordinary citizens at the local/micro level (Brand & Thomas, 2005). Cities have started different initiatives that embark on, for example, eco-developments and strategic policies to address climate change (Bulkeley & Broto, 2012). Hence, urban spaces and citizens are made to adapt to changes to meet the demands of international competition (Brand & Thomas, 2005). However, some municipalities face
challenges in the implementation of climate governance as a result of the complexities and contradictions within the political-economic system (Bulkeley & Broto, 2012). In this instance, planners face a challenging role in balancing neoliberal mechanisms and social equity ideology.

With the increasing focus on sustainable development and the devolution of responsibility from national to provincial and local governments, the role of local authorities has evolved and expanded to include sustainability initiatives. Following this argument, Rosol et al. (2017) outlined the varied governmental strategies that contribute to urban sustainability initiatives, namely:

- Growth-oriented development that values urban competitiveness and the adoption of ‘best practices’ in environmental policies;
- Neo-managerial competitive urban governance that entails mainly government and public sector initiatives with promotion and funding being made available to support sustainable developments, which includes ‘innovation hubs’ or pilot projects;
- Best-practice-driven demonstration or pilot projects that generate lessons and sustainability models that can be replicated;
- City-centric urban sustainability that has become mostly concentrated at the city/neighbourhood scale; and
- Socio-spatially selective strategies that contribute to how urban spaces are socially determined. Urban landscapes are often transformed to appeal to upper-middle class and international investments which consequently lead to inequalities and inequitable access to urban spaces. The disadvantaged population is progressively apportioned to marginalized areas.

Research also shows a link between neoliberal polices and social justice (Jessop, 1998; Hall & Hubbard, 1996). According to Jessop (1998, 96), “there are the strategic dilemmas which not only beset any choice of entrepreneurial goals and economic growth more generally against other desiderata (social inclusion, democratic calculation, accountability etc).” In the neoliberal model, social concerns are typically grounded in privatization of urban development initiatives. Hall & Hubbard (1996) also argued that urban entrepreneurialism has failed to alleviate the social and economic problems, including the social inequity, of many cities. A contradiction exists between economic factor and social responsibilities as they have misaligned priorities. In this instance these include private interests, which seek their own self-interest versus public interests – referring to the welfare of the general public. In addition, policies and projects
are unevenly investing in urban spaces, potentially creating tensions in terms of social justice.

The above section highlighted the role of neoliberalism in urban planning and the different forms it takes within the urban landscape. It also outlined the key themes in neoliberal urban development and how this is framed in cities and neighbourhood, as well as the shortcomings that are associated with neoliberal policies and entrepreneurial governance.

2.3. Social sustainability

This section focuses on the social dimensions of sustainability. This paper is rooted in the concept of social equity highlighting fairness and equitable provision of public goods. This also facilitates social justice. Social sustainability is an often undervalued pillar of the sustainability framework. In a neoliberal understanding, sustainable development deliberations often concentrate on a reconciliation of environmental and economic pillars of sustainability. Nevertheless, more emphasis should be placed on all the components of sustainability if integration is to be a key component of the concept. There is no agreed upon definition of social sustainability. Stren and Polese (2000, 16-17) define social sustainability as “development (and/or growth) that is compatible with the harmonious evolution of civil society, fostering an environment conducive to the compatible cohabitation of culturally and socially diverse groups while at the same time encouraging social integration, with improvements in the quality of life for all segments of the population”. This definition by Stren and Polese (2000) focuses on social integration and social diversity which promote social equity. This definition can be linked to social exclusion and how it can strengthen social cohesion – which was popularized by Lenoir (1974).

Often, definitions used in policy and practice have been either vague or non-existent (Davidson, 2010). In addition to the definitional problem, there is a lack of consensus on connotation, approaches and practices for addressing social challenges (Dempsey, Bramley, Power & Brown, 2009). Research also highlights how urban governance systems are used in the implementation of social sustainability policies. A small number of regions and municipalities in Canada have adopted social sustainability policy frameworks (Davidson, 2010). For example, Metro Vancouver adopted the Livable
Region Strategic Plan in 1996. The main strategies of the plan are (i) protect the green zone (ii) complete communities (iii) compact metropolitan region and (iv) increase transportation choices. In 2011 the Metro Vancouver Board unanimously approved the Regional Growth Strategy which replaced the Liveable Region Strategic Plan and thus expanded the goals to include sustainable economy and sustainable food production (Metro Vancouver, 2011). This has contributed to strategic sustainability initiatives within Metro Vancouver (Holden, 2011).

In addition, political leadership has been the driving force behind social sustainability strategies as an urban policy concept. This has been applied to bundle together several policy concepts and programs, the dominant theories being equity, community building and well-being. Hence, implementation of social sustainability varies across the different cities and contexts, resulting in conceptual practical differentiation (Joss, 2015; Davidson, 2010). For example, social sustainability policy can talk of affordable housing (in Ottawa, Canada), or liveability (in Boulder, USA), with a more comprehensive characterization of social sustainability espoused by Metro Vancouver. According to Hillier (2007, 197), the varied approaches are necessary and unavoidable in the application of social sustainability practice, the arrangement of transcendent notions and signifiers in spatial planning practice such as “public good, sustainability, smart growth, multiculturalism and spatial planning “

2.3.1. Social sustainability approaches – theory and practice

In order to review how social sustainability was prioritised in relation to its triple bottom line counterparts i.e. economic and environmental factors, the International City Managers Association (ICMA) conducted a national sustainability survey in 2010 involving 8,569 US local governments. For this survey, 2,176 local governments responded; the survey response was 25.4% (Svara et al., 2014). The results of the study highlighted that 94% of the respondents considered the economy to be a high priority, while 62% stated that the environment was a priority and only 38% considered social justice to be important. However, there was extensive support for affordable housing i.e. 48%. (Svara et al., 2014). These results highlight the low priority afforded to social justice relative to the economy and the environment by US local governments pursuing sustainability.
Research on social sustainability has also focused on the urban form. Bramley et al. (2009) highlighted that social equity in relation to the urban form refers to access to services and opportunities, thereby taking into consideration public transportation, job opportunities, recreational space, open space, job opportunities and affordable housing. Bramley et al. (2009) also investigated the impact of the urban form specifically relating to compactness in five British cities. The findings showed that compact cities do not benefit all pillars of sustainability, with social sustainability especially being neglected. Dempsey et al. (2009) also provided a framework of urban form and social sustainability. The social dimensions of compact cities were classified as either non-physical or physical factors and these are categorized as follows (Table 3):

Table 3: Social dimensions of sustainable development  
(Dempsey et al., 2011: 291)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-physical factors</th>
<th>Predominantly physical factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>Urbaneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice: inter- and intra-generational</td>
<td>Attractive public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation and local democracy</td>
<td>Decent housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, quality of life and well-being</td>
<td>Local environmental quality and amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion (and eradication of social exclusion)</td>
<td>Accessibility (e.g. to local services and facilities/employment/green space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Sustainable urban design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Walkable neighbourhood: pedestrian friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair distribution of income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cohesion (i.e. cohesion between and among different groups)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community and belonging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential stability (vs turnover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active community organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural traditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the context of this study’s objective to investigate the provisions made for the social dimensions of sustainability in urban neighbourhood redevelopment, as indicated in Table 3, physical and non-physical factors can lead to the provision of equal opportunity to participate in sustainability activities and shape their development. Dempsey et al. (2009) conducted an extensive literature review of social dimensions of urban social sustainability. Emphasis was placed on social sustainability characteristics, including place-making and the community becoming integral to the process of neighbourhood development.
An important element of social sustainability is social equity, which is discussed in the following section.

2.3.2. Conceptualization of social equity and justice

According to Partridge (2005), a socially sustainable community is just, equitable, inclusive and democratic and provides a decent quality of life for current and future generations. Social equity is defined as a fair distribution of resources and an avoidance of exclusion (Dempsey et al., 2012). The notion of social exclusion presumes a barrier in economic, social and political forms as a result of which individuals cannot fully participate in the community in which they live (Manzi, Lucas, Jones & Allen, 2010). This also hinders social cohesion, which is defined as “the willingness of individuals to cooperate and work together at all levels of society to achieve collective goals” (Jeannotte et al., 2002: 3). This refers to the harmony among different groups of people (regardless of income, ethnicity or religion), sense of belonging to place and a shared sense of common purpose. This is linked to place attachment and identity and thus social inclusion becomes paramount (Forrest & Kearns, 2001: 2128).

Social equity also relates to the social advantage or benefits of an individual or social group in relation to others within society, which ultimately affects the social justice outcomes in society. In framing this within the research question, it is vital to achieve a socially just community in a green neighbourhood without jeopardizing economic efficiency and environmental sustainability. In the social sustainability framework, different themes emerge. These include fairness, equity, well-being, social justice, quality of life and social relationships (Eizenberg & Jabareen, 2017; Dempsey et al., 2009).

Reconciliation with Indigenous populations is often not adequately addressed in the social sustainability literature. It is important to acknowledge provision for reconciliation with the Indigenous population, especially in the neighbourhood planning process so as to address social justice. According to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) (2015: 6):

Reconciliation is about establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in this country. In order for that to happen, there has to be awareness of the past, an
acknowledgement of the harm that has been inflicted, atonement for the causes, and action to change behaviour.

However, this thesis also acknowledges that reconciliation is necessary in respect of intergenerational impacts of colonisation and the displacement from Indigenous land. The concerns of marginalization and social inclusion are critical in order to address reconciliation. This also implies giving voices to the marginalized population in the urban development process. The importance of acknowledgment of the displacement of the Indigenous population from their lands, and recognition of their traditional territory and of the place that they still consider part of their heritage cannot be overemphasized in this study.

Part of the present study is based on Fainstein’s (2000) ‘just city’ model, which proposes a theory of urban justice in which the application of equity, democracy and diversity to how social sustainability is framed are central. Fainstein’s (2010) framework emerges from surveying the works of urban scholars such as David Harvey, Henri Lefebvre, Nancy Fraser and Amartya Sen, and other existing literature that focuses on social justice and capitalist market logic within the developed world context. Fainstein also uses case studies of New York, London and Amsterdam. According to Fainstein, the definition of the just city is “a city in which public investment and regulation would produce equitable outcomes rather than support those already well off” (Fainstein, 2010: 3).

Fainstein’s standpoint advocates the dismissal of neoliberal ideologies that underly most urban policies in most cities around the world. Fainstein (2010) regards justice as the first evaluative principle to be used in policy making in existing and potential institutions and programs. In the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods, equity concerns such as transportation, social services and housing are taken into consideration. According to Fainstein (2010: 37), equity implies fairness (distributional equity) “in which policy aims at bettering the situation of those who without state intervention would suffer from relative deprivation.”

Fainstein (2010: 172) lays out guiding principles for planning and policy in the promotion of justice as follows:
• New housing developments should be initiated, including housing for low-income people ‘either on-site or elsewhere’.

• Affordable housing units should remain affordable in perpetuity.

• Households or businesses should not be involuntarily relocated.

• Economic development policies must give precedence to small, locally rooted businesses over large corporations.

• Megaprojects should be subjected to height requirements and provide low-income people with benefits.

• Transit fares for commuter rail should be high, while fares for intercity travel should be low.

• Planners should take an active role in deliberative settings and advocate for egalitarian processes.

To promote diversity in the community, Fainstein (2010) stated that:

• Households should not be required to move to increase diversity, but neither should new segregated neighbourhoods be allowed (including those that generate class segregation).

• Zoning should foster social inclusion.

• Boundaries between districts should be porous.

• Public spaces should be widely accessible and varied. At the same time, groups with clashing lifestyles should not occupy the same location.

• Land uses should be mixed.

• Affirmative action (relating to previously disadvantaged populations) housing, education, and employment should be implemented.

Based on the guiding processes outlined above, Fainstein highlights a pragmatic concern for social reform in urban planning and practice. The pragmatic view on social issues allows for different views to be used when analyzing problems and developing solutions for social concerns. Fainstein’s theory has been also expanded and critiqued by various scholars in the book Searching for the just city (Marcuse et al., 2009). Dikeç (2009) expanded the just city notion by also adding Lefebvre’s ‘right to the city’ concept, which not only focuses on the formulation of certain rights, but also the consideration of spatial dimensions of injustice and thereby transformation of existing economic structures. This brings political philosophic and political economic understanding of
justice together in the reconsideration of spatial dynamics in the city. Potter and Novy (2009) provided recommendations in the advancement of Fanstein’s just city research and this includes investigating gender and sexuality, environmental sustainability, scale and spatiality. In framing the argument for this paper, social sustainability is an evolving concept: "Social sustainability is neither an absolute nor a constant. It has to be considered as a dynamic concept, which will change over time in a place" (Dempsey et al, 2011).

To supplement Fainstein’s just city model (2010), Dempsey et al. (2012) also highlighted how the urban form has an impact on social justice. In the context of social equity, accessibility is referred to as good and equitable access by utilizing walking, public transport, and cycling networks within the neighbourhood and adjacent areas. The focus on accessibility is critical because inaccessibility can be a barrier to opportunity and can intensify social exclusion in urban neighbourhoods. Therefore, transport equity ensures that there is equitable provision of access for all groups, and consequently reduces mobility-based social exclusion (Tumlin, 2012). In order to provide for social inclusion and social equity in society, transportation choices should be guided by consideration of accessibility, availability and cost (Uteng, Singh & Hagen, 2019).

The conceptualization of social sustainability in urban development is a complex process as it entails different framings from different authors. This literature review shows that a comprehensive definition is multifaceted and there is often overlap in the different explanations of concepts of social sustainability. Within the neighbourhood development context, social sustainability implies catering to different groups of people. This includes promoting equity amongst people who have different needs and expectations of space. It also includes those with different household sizes; different ethnicities and religions; different age groups (accessibility and housing needs for elders often present unique challenges); and different gender and sexual identities. This thesis does not significantly address population-based exclusion.

For the purposes of this thesis, the focus is on social exclusion based on socio-economic factors within the neighbourhood context. This implies that despite differences in socio-economic background, there is equitable access and inclusion in community activities, thus creating a more socially equitable community. The conceptualization of social exclusion takes into consideration not only personal circumstances but also
relates to the collective resources to which they have access. Therefore, transportation and housing options and availability of public spaces become key in identifying the exclusionary practices that can be witnessed at a neighbourhood level. Within a capitalist society, neoliberal policies thus have implications for social justice outcomes at the neighbourhood scale.

2.4. Implications of neoliberal policies for social justice at a neighbourhood scale

Drawing from the theoretical frameworks of social justice, this study also highlights how neoliberal policies impact urban planning. Urban policies, plans and designs for cities, can be used as part of a constructive effort to make urban areas more inclusive, as part of urban planning. Neighbourhoods play a crucial role in reducing social exclusion, and the use of policy approaches such as mixed communities becomes crucial in reducing social exclusion based on income (Manzi, Lucas, Jones & Allen, 2010).

In the just city framework, Fainstein emphasizes equity as the most critical criterion. However, under neoliberalism equity is often compromised through the commodification of urban spaces, including land, public space, housing and transportation. As mentioned previously, neighbourhoods are used as a testing bed for both sustainability implementation and neoliberal policies, but the intended targets are not always met, and neither is the vision for integrating environmental and social equity goals. Therefore, it is important to examine the implications of neoliberal policies for social justice at a neighbourhood scale.

Neoliberal policies depend on the private sector to provide for public amenities. This might occur when the local government stipulates planning obligations in its urban development process. Therefore, the planning obligations are used as a mechanism to address social sustainability (Fox-Rogers & Murphy, 2015). This includes the provision of additional infrastructure, including affordable housing, public spaces and provision of transportation. All these contribute to more general community needs. A negotiation process is normally based on market conditions which have an impact on achieving broader social sustainability goals.
2.4.1. Housing

Social exclusion within urban spaces has been attributed to neoliberal policies and weakened social services. Capitalist mechanisms dictate who belongs where, and who is deserving and worthy. This has become a concern for local governments when considering how they can address social justice problems at a neighbourhood level. Neighbourhoods are therefore actively promoted as platforms for policy implementation for social justice. Local governments increasingly rely on the private sector to provide goods and services. This gives rise to the neglect of public interests, as long as private sector actors and neoliberal factors emphasize individualism and private interests.

Research shows that affordable and inclusive housing is rarely provided under neoliberal policies (Walks, 2009). According to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Company (CMHC), housing is ‘affordable’ if it costs less than 30% of a household’s before-tax income. Provision of affordable housing is a key planning initiative supporting social sustainability.

Other initiatives adopted by local governments in the pursuit of entrepreneurialism are the implementation of policies that encourage urban renewal and the reclamation of brownfield land. When brownfields are cleaned up and neighbourhoods are redeveloped, value is realised by developers. In many instances, the assumed land would have been abandoned for several years and be in a derelict state, but would be consequently transformed and reinvented, with the addition of amenities that enhance liveability, thereby making the location more attractive (Anguelovski, 2015). Enhanced environmental amenities can often be afforded by more affluent people, and the added amenities and greening of neighbourhoods increase the attractiveness of the area and the liveability aspects thereof, to the extent that these areas end up catering for high-income residents. This inherently excludes the low-income population. This leads to the development of solely middle- and upper-class housing in previously undeveloped areas. This process is referred to as ecological gentrification (Fitzgerald & Lenhart, 2015).

To further expand on the mechanisms of social exclusion, the development of green neighbourhoods and the housing market highlight that in the capitalist economy, housing is circulated based on wealth (Gould & Lewis, 2017). Neighbourhoods with green technologies, well-maintained public spaces, greenways and strategic location
close to the downtown are often associated with premium costs that only a few can afford (Anguelovski, 2015). Thus, social-spatial exclusion becomes a dominant theme witnessed within urban developments and is visible at a neighbourhood level, where rich and poor or different racial groups inhabit different spaces.

Fitzgerald and Lenhart (2016, 365) referred to this as “islands of green privilege” characterized by added amenities and a social homogeneity which enhances the lifestyle and liveability of residents within their community. Therefore, these places are non-inclusive, with marginalized populations often excluded and, due to their limited options for housing, restricted to areas that do not provide environmental amenities (Anguelovski, 2015). Thus, in the various ways described, social-spatial exclusion is reinforced within ‘sustainable’ developments. It also highlights that neighbourhoods can provide more opportunities for certain population groups while restricting others. In this regard, market mechanisms play a huge role in determining location and housing types. This also links to social exclusion.

2.4.2. Public amenities

Public amenities, including playgrounds, parks, recreation centres, community spaces and transportation infrastructure, play a crucial role in the built environment and contribute to the social life of any community. In the planning of transportation strategies at the neighbourhood level, it is important to consider the need of low-income households for alternatives to private vehicles (such as co-op car ownership, public transit, walking and cycling). The connectivity of the area becomes important in accessing other regions. It also affects social and environmental sustainability. Therefore, this study considers that transportation options are critical in the promotion of social equity, with neighbourhood equitable transportation as essential in accessing services.

According to Vashisth et al., (2018), sustainable transportation systems include the following: car free developments, transit-oriented developments, promoting pedestrians and cyclists, optimization of urban transportation, developing public spaces in city centres, parking management for sustainable transportation and traffic calming. In addition, Lucas et al. (2010) also highlighted the importance of accessibility planning in sustainable communities and how this contributes to socially sustainable communities.
Using Thames Gateway and Warrington Borough in the UK as case studies, they identified local needs and objectives to feed into the negotiation process with the developers. This becomes vital in the development of new communities in a way that promotes social inclusion, cohesion and participation of low-income persons in the community.

Provision of public spaces and amenities is essential for social mixing and inclusion. Ideally, public spaces and amenities provide spaces where members of the community can fully participate in the community and develop community ties. For a more inclusive neighbourhood, the promotion of amenities that offer proximity with other people are regarded as an important element as they provide opportunities for social interactions and also increase social cohesion. The philosophy of social mixing in land use planning suggests that mixed housing communities and public spaces and amenities facilitate social inclusion and integration. In essence, this process reduces marginalization and contributes to a more equitable city.

Within neighbourhoods, social exclusion is often reflected in a lack of adequate public amenities. Wealthy neighbourhoods can compensate for a lack of public green space via private green spaces that include private backyards, balconies and gardens. These private spaces do not make up for a lack of adequate public spaces as they are inequitably distributed based upon who can afford how much. Thus, access is based on economic power, as wealthier residents are afforded the benefit of private amenities which, in turn increase their private property value.

The privatization of public spaces can often lead to an ‘equity deficit’ (Agyeman 2013) in that access is not equitable. Kohn (2004) provided a characterization of public spaces that included (i) unrestricted use, (ii) fee for provision of service and access of site, and (iii) accessibility (see Table 4). They added that public spaces should meet two of the three characteristics listed in Table 4 – either accessibility, unrestricted access or fee for service. To illustrate this point, even though cafes tend to be generally accessible, the expectation is still that users of the space make purchases. This makes them exclusionary to some. However, there is some acknowledgment that it is a challenging process to categorize public space. Table 4 also highlights that government owned spaces are generally more accessible than other parts of the continuum i.e. private owned spaces. Universally inclusive spaces that are accessible, convenient and
usable lead to socially just outcomes that cater for the needs of a diverse range of people (Schmidt & Németh, 2010). Public spaces, especially in high density housing, are essential places that enable residents to establish social interaction and recognition.

Table 4: Dimensions of public spaces
Source: (Kohn 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Fee for service</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Shopping Mall</td>
<td>Cafè, bar</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (profit/nonprofit/cooperative)</td>
<td>City streets, plazas and parks</td>
<td>Theme park, movie theater</td>
<td>Club, church, residential community facilities, office buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>National parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucratic headquarters, military bases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When amenities are provided, their quality is considered to be critical in determining the activities within public spaces that can help determine the inclusiveness of the area.

The quality of the public space contributes to the place-making activities of the people in the neighbourhood, and to a sense of community which is linked to the territorial and relational dimensions of the community (Gusfield, 1975). In this regard, the territorial aspect of the community looks at the physical boundaries and, the relational dimension i.e. the psychological perspective and its impact on the relationships among the members who share the same territory. Therefore, this also highlights the personal connection to the place where they live, in this instance the neighbourhood. This is also linked to place-making in that it can generate a sense of belonging and social inclusion within the communities. This place-making “is the process of creating quality places that people want to live, work, play, and learn in.” (Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU), 2014). This alludes to the process whereby the improvement of public spaces becomes critical in providing spaces that are aesthetically pleasing, safe, accessible, welcoming to everyone and that also enable social interaction. Place-making initiatives have been criticized for catering to elites (Toolis, 2017).
The above section highlights the challenges associated with neoliberal policies i.e. the roll-back and market-oriented approach in relation to public spaces in the neighbourhoods. Place-making is an important but not sufficient tool in creating inclusive spaces. A focus on limiting processes of social exclusion provides a basis for recognizing the concerns of social equity. It also provides a better understanding of how neoliberal forms of governance have an impact on social justice and equity within the neighbourhood.

2.5. Summary of the conceptual framework

Previous sections have shown that the development of green neighbourhoods should not only focus on considering entrepreneurialism and competitive strategies but should also consider social justice. The literature reviewed shows that the just city model and the neoliberal model have contrasting goals, which are highlighted in Table 5.

Table 5: Comparison of characteristics of just city model and neoliberal models of neighbourhood development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Just city model</th>
<th>Neoliberal model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conception of interests</td>
<td>Collective needs—individual as an end but within a context based on interdependency • everyone has the right to the city • to be supported by equity serving government intervention</td>
<td>Individualistic wants (private utility) • based on interests of capital and consumers • with minimal government intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How interests are revealed</td>
<td>Representative democracy • supported by deliberation, practical judgment, and equity-oriented expertise</td>
<td>Consumption through markets or quasi-markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of government</td>
<td>Recognition of past injustices</td>
<td>Competition/pluralism competitiveness and pro-market interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For whom?</td>
<td>Community/public interests</td>
<td>Favoured economic interests and private interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of place</td>
<td>Placemaking</td>
<td>Branding, marketing, promotion and competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the literature review shows the framing of urban policy, in this instance neoliberalism. It includes the reduction of the role of the state in providing public services, the pro-market approach, privileges, market-driven approaches as well as
branding strategies. It also takes an enabling and facilitative approach to urban
development. Neoliberal urban policies have become common in urban development,
as more municipalities are incorporating sustainability objectives into community and city
planning. However, low emphasis is still placed on the social sustainability component.
The neighbourhood scale provides an urban form that contributes to social equity
considerations, including public transportation, recreational space, open space, job
opportunities and affordable housing. In order to promote social equity, the social
cohesion theme that emerged links with a sense of belonging and community
engagement. Therefore, it is critical to evaluate the implementation of neoliberal policies
with respect to their impact on initiatives toward social sustainability at a neighbourhood
scale.
Chapter 3. Research Design and Methodology

This chapter describes the research design and methodology that are used to answer the research questions identified in this study. To gain a better understanding of Dockside Green and social sustainability at Dockside, the paper took a qualitative approach. The various research methodologies used are detailed in this section.

The present study utilizes a case study approach because this allows me to answer the research question as stated in Section 2.2. This approach is best suited to research, that focuses on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context, in this instance the redevelopment of Dockside Green, Victoria during the time period 2001-2018. The case study methodology allows me to retain a holistic approach and a meaningful, embedded analysis of this specific real-life event (Yin, 2009). The case of Dockside Green is depicted as a single ‘instrumental case study’ in that it focuses on the issues of social sustainability and it is used to illustrate this phenomenon (Stake, 1995). The case study approach provides an in-depth examination of the case. This also provides a comprehensive assessment of the research problem and thus facilitates understanding relating to the social equity phenomenon within the neighbourhood context.

3.1. Data collection

This section highlights the data collection procedures and processes for the study.

3.1.1. Documentation

For this study, primary and secondary documents were used as data sources. It is at a local/ neighbourhood scale, so it does not review any national or provincial policy documents but rather reviews the municipal documents outlined below. Secondary data was accessed to review the history of the Dockside Green redevelopment project from 2001 to 2018. Content analysis of the data collected also aided in developing a comprehensive timeline for the development process of Dockside Green. Table 7 highlights the documents that were analyzed during the course of the study.
### Table 6: Documents analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Harbour Plan</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Lands- Geotechnical Report</td>
<td>2001-December 14</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Environmental case</td>
<td>2002, July 04</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>2002- 2018</td>
<td>Time Colonist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock Lands: Request for Proposal</td>
<td>2004, September 10</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Expressions of Interest &amp; Request for Proposal Processes for the Dockside Lands</td>
<td>2004, May</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Development Agreement</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guidelines for the Dockside Area</td>
<td>2005, September 8,</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Strategy</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Sustainability Report</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Green Annual Report</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation and Communication</td>
<td>2006, October 23</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Green Performance indicators</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators for Sustainable Communities: A Case Study of Performance Indicator Initiative</td>
<td>2007, March</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Green Annual Sustainability Report 2008.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Green 2014 Annual report</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Land Use Committee</td>
<td>2015, October 15</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Green Affordable Rental Housing Update to Neighbors</td>
<td>2015, January 26</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing at 370 &amp; 384 Harbor Rd in Victoria West</td>
<td>2015, May 27</td>
<td>Victoria West Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Advisory Design Panel- Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>2015, June 24</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Land Use Committee Victoria West Community</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Green Neighbourhood Update</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockside Green Urban Design Guidelines</td>
<td>2016 December</td>
<td>Dockside Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2. Interviews

Thirteen individuals having involvement with or knowledge of Dockside Green were interviewed for the Ecourbanism Worldwide research project and used with permission for the present study (see Table 7). The interviews were conducted in Summer 2017 and Fall 2018. The responses were used as supplementary information in answering the research questions. Interview-based research was used to gain insights into the respondent’s feelings and thoughts, as well as comprehensive data about their opinions and perceptions. Permission was obtained from all interviewees to use their identities in this research.

Table 7: List of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and organisation and involvement in the project</th>
<th>Involvement with Dockside Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norm Shearing</td>
<td>President, Dockside Green</td>
<td>2013 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Konopaki</td>
<td>Development Co-ordinator, Dockside Green</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Curran</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>2001-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Lee</td>
<td>Principal Landscape Architect, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects</td>
<td>2005 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Marier</td>
<td>Principal Architect, HCMA Architecture + Design</td>
<td>2005-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Fowler</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Helps</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Victoria</td>
<td>2004 to Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Mari</td>
<td>Former developer and resident</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Lui</td>
<td>Development Manager, Catalyst</td>
<td>2016 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brown</td>
<td>President, Catalyst</td>
<td>2013 to Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura Chestnutt</td>
<td>VP Operations &amp; Strategic Initiatives Catalyst</td>
<td>2013 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Maas</td>
<td>Technical Director, Perkins &amp; Will</td>
<td>2002 to 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Wardle</td>
<td>Director of Research, Perkins &amp; Will</td>
<td>2002 to 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3. Field observations

The study involved field observations which were used to assess the public spaces at Dockside Green and the recording of the activities of residents as well as visitors within the outdoor physical environment. I observed the activities that occurred at Dockside Green, especially in the public spaces of the neighbourhood. The study also used a framework (see 2.4) to guide the observations and the analysis of data. Observations were made on the availability and types of public spaces, including amenities, parks and shared spaces; of the types of activities and social gatherings; and of the uses of spaces and connectivity/accessibility, including transport links. The data
from this method was used as a supplementary approach to the interviews and the document analysis. The observations were non-participant in nature as the subjects were not aware of the observations taking place and that they were part of a study.

As a supplement to the data collection, the observations were conducted after the document analysis. It is important to note that the researcher had previously conducted site visits. These included a site tour on March 9, 2018 which was led by the development manager. The second site visit was also led by the development manager on November 9, 2018. An additional tour was undertaken on November 10, 2018 with the operator at the Dockside Green Wastewater Treatment Facility. The non-participant observations were conducted on one occasion in summer on July 27, 2019 over a period of four hours during the morning and afternoon. The non-participant observations also involved walking in the Dockside Green neighbourhood. To record the observations, field notes and photographs were taken. The main goal of the observations was to note the physical surroundings and the built/physical environment and how these could be interpreted based on the researcher’s analysis.

3.2. Data analysis

In order to fulfil the research aim, I analyzed the responses from the in-depth interviews from the individuals listed in Table 7 and the documents listed in section 3.2.1. I sought to understand the social sustainability factors at Dockside Green using an explanatory framework.

NVivo software was used throughout the data analysis process. This was chosen because there was a large amount of data and NVivo offers a convenient way to sort and manage data by cataloguing and grouping texts for accurate, quick and reliable analysis. NVivo assisted in connecting the data through memoing i.e. writing down ideas as prototype data analysis. The organization of the data was guided by the research questions and the research objectives of the study, as stated in Chapter 1. During this process, I used NVivo to aid and simplify the data organization process. My goal was to ascertain that the data was relevant to the research question and the purpose of the study.
Once the data was organized, the next task was to read and become familiar with all the collected data. During the coding process, I used open-coding. Subsequently, the interview transcripts and other relevant material and data were collated and coded. Because the study took an iterative approach, there were several rounds and processes for coding. The initial stage of coding involved methodically developing codes found in the data collected to see if all the data was relevant. The coding process also helped in creating the themes that were relevant to the study. Consequent to the data coding, I looked for patterns from the coded data, and developed a notion to explain the patterns. In addition, I looked for similarities and differences in the data within the different codes. I also reviewed all the themes that emerged, which enabled me to refine them where necessary by either discarding, combining or creating new themes. The definitive list of codes developed and used for the analysis of data is presented in the Appendix.

The themes for the interviews were derived from the quotes and they highlighted references to ideas and sentiments related to social sustainability in green neighbourhoods in the literature review and conceptual framework in Chapters 2 and 4. The quotes were used to describe and explain the research findings in Chapters 4 and 5. Therefore I integrated the quotes into different codes and also analyzed the different roles of the respondents in order to understand the context better. The quotes also highlighted the participants' views and ideas relating to the development at Dockside Green. This provided an analytic narrative and data excerpts, and put the analysis in the broader context of the study.

In summary, I evaluated the social sustainability strategies through the understanding of the dynamics of neighbourhood social sustainability characteristics in Dockside Green. The data analysis provided an understanding of the concepts of neoliberal urban planning at play in relation to social sustainability goals at Dockside Green. It also highlighted the relationship between the City of Victoria and the private developer in establishing the social sustainability strategies. Therefore, the data analysis reflected how Dockside Green currently represents the social dimensions of sustainability on the ground.
Chapter 4. Setting the context for Dockside Green

This chapter details the process of Dockside Green development to date. It also provides a historical background to Dockside Green and the neoliberal development of the neighbourhood. The chapter also discusses research findings from interviews, newspaper articles and the public process documents related to Dockside Green.

4.1. Background to development of Dockside Green

This section provides the background to the development of Dockside Green including the history of the site and how it was later acquired by private developers.

4.1.1. Early history and First Nations people

This study recognizes the historical importance of what is now Dockside Green. The land where Dockside Green is currently located is the original and unceded territory of the Songhees First Nation, referred to by its members as the Lekwungen Nation. They have inhabited this area since time immemorial. Figure 3 shows the First Nations occupation of Songhees Reserve in 1866. This land has intrinsic value for them and is imbued with generational history and traditions. A treaty was signed in 1850 between the Nation and first BC Premier, James Douglas, giving them access to lands that include the present-day Dockside Green. Despite having treaty rights to the reserve, the Lekwungen were confronted with pressure to relocate from their village as early as 1857 (Lutz, 2008).

The Songhees people realised that the authorities were determined to relocate the Nation, with or without their consent (Fisher 1977; Kanakos, 1983). In essence, the Songhees did not have much option but to leave the land that was becoming colonized as central and west Victoria. After protracted negotiations, the Songhees and the provincial government reached an agreement which included a cash settlement (Kanakos, 1983). After succumbing to decades of pressure, the town site of the Songhees people was relocated to east of Esquimalt Harbour (Kanakos, 1983). Their authority over these lands was finalized via a treaty in 2011.
This study recognizes that this part of the history of the area under consideration is important for the analysis of social sustainability, specifically in relation to reconciliation. It is important to recognize the injustice that was perpetrated. In order for there to be an inclusive society in the vicinity of Dockside Green, the process should begin with reconciliation and with the recognition and affirmation of the Songhees people’s rights. This to date has not happened.

From a historical perspective, various harbour fronts have been used as industrial sites in Canada, including Victoria’s former Docklands. After the Province of BC acquired the land, the area was largely used for port activities and shipbuilding. Based on archival sources, it is evident that the site was zoned for heavy industrial use and for a long period of time it was used as an active port. The land was leased to marine industrial businesses by the province. For example, one leasee was Point Hope Maritime shipyard, one of the oldest shipyards, which is still located at Dockside Green, where it has been since 1873. In addition, what is now Tyee Road in Dockside Green became Canadian Railway tracks and freight yards, from which railroad cars could be loaded and unloaded, with freight shipping and cargo buildings on the site. Due to this heavy industrial usage, the land was extensively contaminated.

Much of the east side of the district was under water until the early- to mid-1900s, when it was filled in (see Figure 4). Shipbuilding activities (including ship restoration and
building with painting, welding and sandblasting activities) contributed to the heavy
pollution of the site. Hazardous chemicals contaminated the soil. However, towards the
end of the 20th century, the heavy industrial activities began to decline.

1. Tyee Road. C.N. Rail yards (between 1959 and 1974) Johnson Street Bridge in
background. (City of Victoria Archives Item M01277)

2. Bulk storage facility, Victoria, B.C., served by Canadian National Railways 14 May 1972
(Creation). (City of Victoria Archives Item CR-0144-2-0217)

3. 335-345 Harbour Road. Point Hope Shipyards. (City of Victoria Archives Item M04181)

Figure 4: Former land uses of the Docklands

4.1.2. Sale of Dockside Green for redevelopment

In 1989, the City of Victoria bought the Docklands site for $1 from the province of
BC (City of Victoria, 2001). The price reflected the heavy industrial activities that had
damaged and heavily contaminated the soil (City of Victoria, 2012). Before any form of
development could occur the land that had been affected by the heavy industrial use,
that left the site contaminated with petrochemical spills and heavy metals, had to be
cleaned up (Deveau, 2004).

As the industrial activity lessened, the land lay dormant for years with little
activity. In addition, in the post-industrial era there was a decrease in port activities and
functions within the urban context (Airas & Hall, 2019). Changes associated with shipping and transportation technology also meant that ships had more carrying capacity for cargo, which led to a decrease in port activities (Sieber, 1991). As a result, the piece of land was regarded as a ‘forgotten zone’ (Deveau, 2004). However, in parallel with the above processes, the influx and growth of population in urban centres stimulated development in the City of Victoria and grew the potential for revitalization of the formerly heavy industrial areas.

Management of public land has become increasingly prone to the forces of neoliberalism. Waterfront development in Canada within the context of a post-industrial city becomes important because it provides an opportunity for public officials or the city to achieve broader socio-economic goals for the city. In addition, government takes a lead role in the redevelopment process through the promotion of the redevelopment of the former industrial sites and in articulating and guiding the development process (Sieber, 1991; Eraydın, 2011). Within the last decade there has been a realization by local government that there are financial benefits to this type of development in that the adoption of neoliberal processes involves the privatization of public land and also the relinquishing of all the risks of the project construction to the developer. It also leads to the reduction in the provision of the public services by the private sector (Eraydın, 2011).

In the case of Dockside Green, “the City of Victoria owned this land and they wanted to see it developed and they set some really high environmental goals” (Shearing, interview, 2017). Within the neoliberal framework, Dockside Green became part of a piecemeal development (Swyngedouw, Moular & Rodriguez, 2002). This highlighted the singularity of some planning approaches that are fragmented and unrelated to the trends seen in the rest of the city. The City of Victoria championed the Dockside Green project like no other project; it wanted to realize a wide range of sustainability goals which encompassed environmental, economic and social goals. However, the planning and implementation process of the Docklands for the transformation into a sustainable neighbourhood that is now Dockside Green has been a complex process that has faced challenges, as acknowledged by the individuals who were interviewed.

A neoliberal approach was seen as a solution to the development of Dockside Green. In 2001, the City of Victoria embarked on a comprehensive process in which an
environmental study was conducted to determine the extent and the type of contamination at Dockside Green. This was the beginning of the process by which local government would manage the risk associated with the site. In order to justify the development process on the contaminated site, a business case taking into consideration all benefits and risks in pursuing the project had to be developed by the City of Victoria. In 2002, a comprehensive business case was developed that included a market risk and market demand analysis, a geotechnical study and remediation costs. The business case report outlined the objectives to be met, as well as the feasibility of the project, by considering the different factors that affect the development of the site. The business case also set the minimum return on investment for the city to break even on the redevelopment. The business case and the development concepts were approved by the city council.

It is important to highlight that the process adopted by the City of Victoria does not align with the conventional processes that are normally conducted by local government. The case of Dockside Green also shows the opportunistic and entrepreneurial nature of the invitation that the city made to the private developer in taking part in the redevelopment of the former docklands. Traditionally the city would have sold the contaminated land without servicing the site, or alternatively, would have rezoned the land along with an outline of development requirements (Fowler, 2017). This would be a ‘straightjacket’ process that would clearly stipulate the permitted land uses of the site and would not leave any room for other uses, thus restricting what the developer could do. The City of Victoria decided to take an approach with much more flexibility, by issuing a Request for Proposals.

In 2004, a Request for Proposals (RFP), also referred to as an invitation for a competitive bid process, was sent out to developers. This used the triple bottom Line approach (focusing on social, economic and environmental aspects). The city was dedicated to finding a developer that was committed to the triple bottom line approach. The developer would be evaluated based on a 300-point system, allocating 100 points to each of the pillars of sustainability. The process involved the shortlisting of candidates who best met the required criteria and who would be likely to meet the desired outcomes set out by the city. In this case, they looked for developers with adequate financial resources, knowledge and expertise in the land remediation process. Kim Fowler, city planner at the time, explained the pre-approval process for Dockside Green as follows:
...if you want the good ones to participate you should do a pre-approval process. And that was our request for expression of interest. So, and that basically did a bunch of things. Like you had to have experience developing brownfields; have that experience of doing large sites; tell us you had to do mixed use and you have to have—and I can't remember the number... the RFP, I think it was 200 million dollars capital. If you don't [have] any of that, don't play with us. [If] you don’t have enough experience; [if] you don’t have enough funding (Interview, 2017).

In the second phase of the evaluation, the staff provided recommendations to council. Subsequently, in the third stage, a public meeting was conducted whereby members of the public were provided an opportunity to offer feedback on the selection of the top candidates who were later invited to present their proposals. Within the selection process, creative proposals that were in line with New Urbanism principles of urban development received more points. Fowler added that:

.... we got a short list. .. it was two proponents who remained, [who] were required to make a 20-minute public presentation to Council so the public could watch and comment on before council meetings. So, it’s the only time in my 27 years of planning work that developer got a standing ovation {laughs}. So that’s how this is unusual. That was because it said—and we had set up a triple bottom-line—said: How did you determine the criteria, the criteria to take on development. And put a third environmental, a third, economic and third social control and... and we also provided just, like, the LEED check—an innovation bonus (Interview, 2017).

Vancity, in a 75:25 partnership with Windmill, won the bid based on its proposal, in preference to Westbank Projects Corp. Importantly Vancity, the largest credit union in Canada at the time, could say that it was open to financing community projects, including affordable housing. Meanwhile Windmill Development, led by Joe Van Belleghem, the charismatic public face of Dockside, had experience with innovative and sustainable development projects (Wilson, 2009).

Other prominent partners were also brought into the project. Peter Busby, one of the leading green architects in Canada and founding member of the Canada Green Building Council, teamed up with Perkins and Will and provided master planning through a triple bottom line approach. Stantec provided consulting and engineering services. Bringing different partners to the project ensured that Dockside Green would achieve its sustainability vision, including commitment to the highest LEED certification.
LEED’s pilot program (LEED Version 1.0) was first introduced in 1998. Thus, in the early 2000s LEED was relatively new and in its early phase of development. Its potential had not yet been fully realised. The commitment to being innovative through the use of LEED was an integral part of the Vancity/Windmill proposal. Lee, principal landscape architect for Dockside, stated that:

I think part of the reason why they were successful winning the bid for the property was because they demonstrated innovation which, you know, in 2005 obviously sustainability was quite an emerging topic and that was really quite innovative to begin with. Just at that point [to] say “we are going to do a sustainable community, whatever that is”. And you know, at that time, at the bidding phase of the project, you know we had made a decision to commit to LEED and it was LEED Gold and LEED Platinum (Interview, 2017).

Dockside Green was seen as a prototype or model for sustainability at a neighbourhood level. Norm Shearing, the first president of Dockside Green, also highlighted that when Dockside Green was introduced, it was intended to display LEED’s capabilities:

.... I think they saw Dockside Green as a real opportunity to showcase LEED and what it could do for promoting environmental development across Canada. And as a result of that there was a lot, you know, many initiatives that were imposed by the city, and agreed to by Dockside Green Limited. And then a number of initiatives that were just Dockside Green limited wanted to do more, so that would be, you know, LEED platinum for all buildings (Interview 2017).

Shearing’s above comment highlights that emphasis was placed on the environmental aspects of sustainability and also on ensuring that Dockside had LEED Platinum buildings.

The Vancity and Windmill partnership won the bid at $600 mil to redevelop Victoria’s Dockside lands into what is now Dockside Green. Aspects of their approach that were considered to be innovative included provision of a biomass gasification plant, on-site water treatment and pursuing LEED certification. The proposal lacked emphasis on the social sustainability aspects. In 2005, Vancity and Windmill purchased the Docklands for $8.5 mil with the remediation cost estimated to be $6 mil. With the purchase of the site, the City of Victoria also required the developers to sign a Master Development Agreement MDA) that the city had drafted. The development build-out planned to have 26 buildings and 2500 residents, provided in a total of seven phases.
In 2006, construction began on the site. In 2008, Phase 1 of the project, Synergy, was certified LEED Platinum and the neighbourhood received LEED-ND certification. Fowler stated that at the time that the local government had control, the approval process was stringent and cumbersome, it included anti-development sentiments, and there was low approval of development permits. Within the context of the City of Victoria, the anti-development sentiments led to initiatives such as restrictive zoning, and a tedious process regarding the building/development approvals process. This was time-consuming and increased the costs of the development process for all parties. Dockside Green was projected to be a leading-edge and innovative sustainability project; thus, it received overwhelming support from the City and the council.

In order to promote innovation and sustainability at a local level, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), a membership organization of municipalities, established the Green Municipal Fund (GMF) in 2000. This fund mainly promotes and encourages investment in municipal projects that showcase best practice and innovation. These funds are also used to promote public and private partnerships and to cover some of the expenses incurred by the developer in creating a sustainable community. However, the funds only recognize environmental initiatives such as efficient energy and water use as well as waste management, and do not necessarily include any components of social sustainability.

Dockside Green was one of the beneficiaries of the funds and received $350,000 from the GMF and $85,000 from the Province of BC. Joe Van Belleghem was reported by the Times Colonist as stating that “he doesn’t regard the grant as a subsidy but rather a cost-sharing with government” (Heiman, October 13, 2006). In addition, the City of Victoria’s mayor at the time, Mayor Alan Lowe, acknowledged that it was unusual for federal funds to be directed to a private development project. Mayor Alan Lowe, cited by the Times Colonist newspaper, stated that “the world is looking at this project. What they do...will be helpful to encourage other projects in the nation to look at sustainable issues” (Heiman, October 13, 2006). This represents the neoliberal approach that provided and supported the Dockside Green pilot project. This innovative initiative was intended to be replicated across the country.
4.1.3. The vision for Dockside Green

The initial vision for the Dockside Green site was directed by the City of Victoria, which required a triple bottom line approach to sustainability. Joe Van Belleghem of Windmill Development was the public face and the visionary behind Dockside Green. When he joined the project, he brought with him his green building experience from previous projects, which included green building development through the transformation of Glendale Hospital into the Vancouver Island Technology Park. His vision was to transform the derelict brownfield into a sustainable neighbourhood. The high level of commitment to LEED was seen as an exception at the time. News coverage by newspapers based in the City of Victoria highlighted the bold declarations and pronouncements that were made about the Dockside Green project and what it was going to achieve. One of the main assertions was that Dockside Green was going to be the first development that would be greenhouse gas positive and which would have a district energy system that would be using biomass wood products. Fowler went on to explain that:

....district energy system was supposed to be even make us greenhouse gas negative so that promise about at least being neutral is not the case, these they run with natural gas now, 100% of the time..(Interview, 2017).

Fowler also explained how difficult it was to acquire the wood chips:

......they did not use and this is from the experts I work with in ... district systems ... is a was too simple a system or if I can say it fussy the wood waste had to be no bigger than my thumb long, so six cm long and it had to be dry and clean, I don’t know too many places, except the only place we ended up sourcing for, I was running around trying to source you know woodchips for them, and woodchips are not a waste on Vancouver Island. They are in very high demand so they are not cheap so they ended up getting like a furniture manufacturer in Yellowpoint, like I saw them little you know curlicues, those are the only things that worked in there, and then they only had storage for not even a three day weekend, you know you should have a whole week’s storage and you can easily bring barging in there and they build it across the road which is what they did but you should have built much bigger facility with the you know and so the system they had was not sophisticated enough to do to actually do what they said they would do and then they made all that money to send that across to the hotel, that’s never been used, I did confirm with the hotel that so and that would have been greenhouse gas negative had it been turned on, so there still was the expectation, there still is...... (Interview 2017).
In addition, the goal was for the site to be the most innovative neighbourhood development, not only in Canada but also North America, as well as a model for sustainable community development. Jacques Khourie of Vancity Enterprises was cited by the Times Colonist as stating that “Our goal is to create a world-class model for sustainable development, nothing less than that” (Cleverley, October 12, 2005). Maura Chestnutt from Catalyst stated that the Dockside Green development was “originally set up so that it had a romance to it” (Interview, 2018). This implies that it was envisioned as a utopian neighbourhood and was also promoted as a tranquil landscape that would support the sustainability goals of the city. Therefore, there was a lot of excitement and anticipation around the development of the site. This was associated with optimism about sustainable development which would not only aid in addressing climate change but also provide for sustainable housing development.

Joe Van Belleghem, during his publicity and marketing regarding the project, was reported to have indicated that his vision for the future of the site was to make Dockside Green a “global showcase for sustainability” (Curtis, December 8, 2004). The site was seen as an anomaly as there was no other site pursuing sustainability in the City. As Mayor Lowe stated:

Van Belleghem said he knows council will be asked: "How can you treat Dockside differently?" But there is no other development in the community as committed to sustainable development as we are (Interview, 2017).

Due to the innovative vision for the Dockside Green site, tremendous support was received from the residents and the city councillors. For instance, Van Belleghem stated that when they were involved in the zoning process, “during the approval for the design for our first building, which normally took a year to process, the planner asked me to open my computer and I opened it. And council said "Shut your computer. All in favour now". That sent a ripple effect through the development industry” (USGBC, 2013).

The approval of Dockside Green highlights that the council was fully in support of the Dockside Green project. The project had the full support of the City of Victoria and this also showed that the developers could begin to consider sustainability in the development processes. As stated, when the proposal was presented to the city council, it received an uncharacteristic standing ovation (Cleverley, October 12, 2005). In addition, van Belleghem also highlighted the same sentiment as Fowler (2017), namely
that there was no opposition to the project; this was unheard of in Victoria. The manner in which the vision was proposed appealed to environmental concerns, which enabled the permit and zoning process to be fast tracked.

The site’s vision and its ambitious goals to become the most sustainable neighbourhood in the world attracted attention not only from developers and delegations from the City of Victoria, but also international delegations from Australia, Korea, China, the Ukraine, Japan and Italy (Dockside Green, 2011). However, the site failed to meet some of its goals. The vision did not consider the market downturn that would interfere with the ambitions for the site. Thus, the predefined goals and timeframe of the project were later modified to be more feasible and attainable.

4.1.4. The development process of Dockside Green

The Dockside plan was envisioned according to a master plan for the site (see Figure 5). The goal of the project was to transform the site from an eyesore into the most sustainable and liveable community in North America. Peter Busby of Busby, Perkins and Will architecture and design firm was tasked with the master planning for the development.

![Dockside Green Site Plan](Source: City of Victoria 2006)
Busby explained that the goal was to design a community that used green building techniques and LEED principles within the overall concept design and used principles encompassing waste and water management, transportation, ecological and community impact (Klean Industries, 2006).

According to Perkins and Wills’ principal urban designer Rod Mass (2018), the development of Dockside Green was based on extensive research, not only on new urbanism, but also on the innovative approach that would promote environmental sustainability:

Dockside, I think for work we got out of Dockside, the innovation out of it was, there was innovation kind of on top of the piping, the plumbing, the codes. There were some codes that weren’t written…. certain things that plumbing inspectors had to look for. And, you know, biomass wasn’t there, and they had no way to look at … wastewater, because there wasn’t any, there’s no code that, it just goes off the point….. (Interview, 2018).

Dockside Green, as an innovative development, aimed at being a trendsetter in the development process. As highlighted above, some of the government codes and policies for the utilization of the technologies did not yet exist. The City of Victoria set the vision for the triple bottom line approach as the basis of the master plan, and this was the basis upon which the community was to be constructed. According to Kathy Wardle, urban designer and associate principal and director of research at Perkins and Will:

…..[in] triple bottom line approach to master planning and, ultimately building out the community, we were responsible for doing the masterplan of the project in 2002, 2004, [and] sort of 2005. And so, for, you know, for a million square foot development I would say there was a scalability of opportunity around looking at how water was managed on site. City of Victoria certainly does not, even today, have great wastewater treatment policies. And so the developer really saw this as an opportunity to do something right to showcase, I would say, best in class technologies around at the time around wastewater development (Interview, 2018).

The above also shows that the main aim was for the site to be used as a showcase for sustainable development. It was meant to be a model for other sustainable communities. Dockside Green managed to come up with more environmental innovation than had ever been seen. However, even though the project took a triple bottom line approach, the emphasis was on the environmental sustainability components and this subjugated the social sustainability goals.
4.2. Purchase agreement – MDA

The Master Development Agreement (2005) was a legal agreement that was signed between the City of Victoria and the developer, Dockside Green Limited Partnership, namely Vancity and Windmill. It stipulated the standards and conditions that governed development of the site. This contract allowed the City of Victoria to demand and negotiate for public amenities and affordable housing (which contributes to the general public good). With this MDA, the city could also set specific deadlines by which the developer would provide amenities and the required performance guarantees for the project. The MDA (2005) detailed the numerous obligations and expectation for both parties, which included the LEED obligations, meeting the rezoning by-laws, the design guidelines, and the provision for affordable housing, and amenities – offsite and onsite – through a phased development.

This agreement between the City and the developer was voluntary, although binding to the current and future parties. Dockside Green was a phased development which was outlined in the Local Government Act, Part 14, Division 12; Phased development agreements. This transformed the project into a multi-phase development which was intended to produce regulatory certainty for both the City of Victoria and the developers. The implication was that the MDA was to be used as a mechanism for private land use control, providing a guarantee to both the developer and to the city that the commitments and obligations set out would not change under any circumstances. The current mayor for the City of Victoria, Lisa Helps, stated that since Dockside Green was also part of a larger community of Victoria West, the redevelopment also “gave certainty to the surrounding neighbourhood”. Further:

I think it’s great, yeah, it’s really great. Because then everybody knows what to expect. What to expect in terms of height of buildings; what to expect in terms of open green space; what to expect in terms of if you buy now in Dockside and you are going to live there for the next 40 years, what do the next 40 years look like. And it also gives certainty for the surrounding neighbourhood. (Interview, 2017)
4.2.1. Development obligations set out in the MDA

The obligations highlighted in the MDA (2005) pertaining to social sustainability included those related to affordable housing, public amenities, the transportation demand management strategy, LEED certification and ongoing mentoring.

Affordable housing was addressed in Section 9 of the MDA (2005), which stated that thirty percent of the residential units on the site would be developed and designated for non-market and market affordable housing units, including rental and non-rental units. This strategy was seen as one that supported a strong and inclusive community.

According to the MDA (2005), affordable housing meant “costs (rent or mortgage plus taxes and including 10% down payment) 30% or less of a household’s gross annual income, targeting households with an income of $30,000 to $60,000”. In addition, the developer was required to provide $3 mil towards affordable housing units. The developer was also required to put a cap on the profit of thirteen percent of the entire development cost and twenty percent of the entire units. The developer was also required to provide for the non-market units in the development: (i) free initial car share membership for up to $500; (ii) a bicycle for up to $200 and (iii) a bus pass subsidy of $15 per month in the first three years of occupancy. However, the MDA waived LEED Platinum certification obligations on buildings that were designated solely for affordable housing.

With regard to public amenities, the developer agreed to build all public amenities in the first three years of the development. These were outlined and defined in Schedule G of the MDA (2005). This encompassed the onsite utilities, specifically, the wood-waste power generation facility and sewage facility. The developer also agreed to add public amenities, including public washrooms, main plaza, play area, bike racks, and an upgrade of the Galloping Goose trail.

A Sustainability centre was also part of the amenities package stipulated by the City of Victoria, for which the developer was required to contribute $400,000. The space would be up to 50,000 square feet and it was specified as a four-storey building. In addition, it was intended to provide a space for local organizations engaging in social justice activities, including cultural, recreational and educational facilities; a tourist facility; environmental research facilities; and commercial space such as retail space. It
was proposed as a ground-breaking and archetypal green building which would provide a learning laboratory.

Schedule 8 of the MDA also set out the requirements for the public realm within the provision for the public amenities. Therefore, the site was required to provide for a high-quality public realm which provided for “quality public open and green spaces and naturalized habitats that provide ecosystem benefits as well as urban living benefits by being pedestrian friendly, safe, and supporting a range of work and leisure activities”. The developer was also required to provide for the operating costs of the public realm. The public realm requirement would be applied to: (i) the waterfront walkway and a small non-motorized boat launch/pier, (ii) improvements to the Galloping Goose trail, (iii) open/green spaces, (iv) a sustainability centre, (v) Market assisted housing (vi) a fire hall, and (vii) public art.

The Transportation Demand Management Strategy, Section 7 of the MDA, was employed to “reduce the number of vehicle trips in and out of the development, and to reduce the demand for parking generated by the development.” These outlined a set of strategies intended to create alternative sustainable transportation choices. In order to encourage transportation alternatives, Dockside Green was zoned with parking maximums. The parking standard was set at less than one parking spot per unit and it was intended that there should be less accessible per metre parking requirements. These requirements were more stringent than those that applied in the City of Victoria as a whole. Thus, the developer was also expected to reduce the need for parking in the Dockside Green development area. Elements expected to be included in these strategies (MDA, 2005) included (if the developer had met the requirements):

(i) Mini-bus program: The developer was required to acquire a mini-transit vehicle(s) at the cost of $60,000. However, this has not been achieved to date.

(ii) Car share co-op: The developer was required to acquire car share co-op memberships which were valued at $240,000 and thus the residents would not have to pay for the co-op. This program has been in place since 2008 and is ongoing.

(iii) Bicycle traffic and storage: Bicycle racks would be to the LEED or City standard whichever was higher at the time. These would be provided for 15% of residential occupants. Bicycle racks and shower facilities would be provided for 5% of
the commercial, office and industrial use. The developer would provide additional lock up racks if demand warranted. In addition, 150 extra bike racks would be provided in compliance with the Development Amenity Schedule D. Only 33 have been provided to date.

(iv) Coordination with BC Transit: The MDA (2005) also stated that the developer would work closely with BC Transit to provide a smaller transit service for the development. To date this has not been accomplished. However, Dockside has bus #14 on Bay Street and #15 on Esquimalt but this is adjacent to the neighbourhood and no bus is routed through Tyee Road. In addition, there was a commitment to offer subsidized bus passes for three years for the residents. This was meant to increase ridership. Residents in the affordable or non-market housing were given $15 per month for this purpose.

(v) Education for residents regarding transportation alternatives: Education and informational support was also considered to be a key component in promoting bikes, transit, and pedestrian modes of traffic. The Dockside website was intended to highlight the main routes for the various uses as well as information on car share and carpooling programs. When browsing through the current Dockside Green website, this information could not be found. But according to the Dockside Green Annual Report (2010), information on alternative transportation options was provided in the initial phases of the project.

The guidelines and requirements of the Transportation Demand Strategy were clearly outlined in Schedule F of MDA (2005) and were also in accordance with Schedule D, the Development Amenity Schedule.

LEED Certification, addressed in Section 11 of the MDA, committed Dockside Green to the attainment of the highest LEED certification (Platinum). The MDA (2005) also specified that if the LEED standard was replaced or amended with more stringent performance criteria, the developer was required to assume the new LEED standard with the approval of the City. The developer was also required to provide a LEED credit checklist as part of the Developer’s Annual Report, as stipulated in schedule J. Should the site not attain their commitment, the developer was charged to pay one dollar per square foot penalty up to $1mil. In addition, if the site, or any portion of the site, changed
ownership, the developer guaranteed that the future owners would remain committed to the attainment of LEED certification.

The above discussion highlights the commitments that were set out by Dockside Green. However, it must be noted that Dockside Green placed greater emphasis on the LEED Platinum commitments. The LEED certification and the commitment to reach high standards of green building was intended to be the trademark for the site, according to Shearing, who stated that:

.... it was very important for Vancity and it was very important for the City of Victoria to be associated with LEED Platinum development. That was not going to go away as a goal, as a fundamental (interview, 2017).

The intention of the MDA was to administer and govern the transfer of land and put in place some responsibility for the construction of public infrastructure. The City of Victoria was required to monitor and conduct an audit (based on Schedule N of the MDA), thereby tracking the performance of the development. If these obligations were not met, a financial penalty was to be enforced.

The developers were also mandated to do annual reporting stating the progress of the development, as outlined in Schedule J, i.e. Developer’s Annual Report Content. It was intended that this would also be used to cross-reference Schedule N, i.e. the City Audit Criteria. In addition, the annual report was required “until the date of substantial completion of all improvements in the development”. The report was intended to establish a standard of performance for the developer. This baseline of performance would also be used by the City of Victoria to measure the long-term effects of the sustainable project.

Further, with respect to ongoing monitoring, Section 4 of the MDA (2005) stipulated that the Dockside Lands had to adhere to the requirements of the Rezoning Bylaw and the Design Guidelines. The developer was required to provide $40,000 annually which would go towards the administering the MDA (2005), including the cost of hiring staff involved in the monitoring process.

Therefore, by establishing the MDA (2005), it was intended to stimulate the redevelopment of what the urban local government categorized as areas of prime and underutilized industrial areas. In addition, it also showed the reliance of the local
governance on the private developer in providing amenities. It is also revealed a trade-off, as the city would not normally have paid for the remediation of the Dockside Green site. According to Brenner and Theodore (2002), neoliberal policies highlighted the unburdening of public responsibilities onto the private sector and the capitalist accumulation of housing markets. It highlighted the green governmentality in that the City of Victoria used the agreement as a means to control and guide the development process of the site.

4.2.2. The Development/Amenity Schedule

The Development/Amenity Schedule was clearly stated in Schedule D of the MDA (2005) (Table 9) and was used by the City of Victoria to commit the developer to providing off-site services and amenities. Traditionally, these services and amenities would have fallen entirely within the responsibility of the City. In Dockside, in effect, the developer assumed the cost of the public amenities. The MDA also specified the project phasing and timing. Dockside Green was phased for completion in 10 years. The schedule had a fixed time schedule providing a timeframe for when completion of the amenities should take place. The Development/Amenity Schedule showed the different amenities identified for completion by 2013. This included the provision of amenities such as a greenway, bike parks, public art, sewage treatment, green technologies, a sustainability centre, a district energy system, car share and mini-transit, bike racks and a play area. The total cost of the public amenities was $ 9,378,490.

Dockside Green set out a strategy for providing for the amenities at the start of the project. Between 2007 and 2009, Dockside Green was able to provide three quarters of the promised amenities, including the sewage treatment facility, improvement to the road networks including the Galloping Goose Trail, bike racks, the greenway, and improvements to the foreshore and shoreline. The thinking behind providing the amenities at the start of the project was not only to provide some assurance to the city and the community, but also to improve the marketability of the neighbourhood.

In addition, the Development/Amenity Schedule specified the remediation to be carried out on the site. According to the MDA (2005), the developer was expected to complete the construction of each amenity by the end of the last calendar year in which the funds were projected and as set out in Schedule D. In the event that the developer
defaulted in the provision of the amenities, the developer would make a financial contribution to the value of the amenity to the Amenity Fund, under section 8.18 of the MDA. Therefore, if any payments were not made to the public amenity, the city could cancel the obligation for the construction of the public amenity.

The schedule also showed that the purchase price of the land was $8.5 mil, the payment for which was phased over up to seven years. However, the developer paid the full purchase price at the time of the acquisition.
Table 8: Schedule D: Dockside Green Amenity/ Development Schedule
Source: City of Victoria: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dockside Costs</th>
<th>1-Sep-06</th>
<th>1-Sep-07</th>
<th>1-Sep-08</th>
<th>1-Sep-09</th>
<th>1-Sep-10</th>
<th>1-Sep-11</th>
<th>1-Sep-12</th>
<th>1-Sep-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price of Land (initial amount paid on rezoning)</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accesses over Esquimalt and Harbour Road (lot 1,2,3,4)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood staircase on SE from Johnson bridge (lot 1)</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Esquimalt Road (lot1)</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>28,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Way</td>
<td>195,100</td>
<td>1,555,960</td>
<td>1,751,080</td>
<td>195,100</td>
<td>1,555,960</td>
<td>1,751,080</td>
<td>1,751,080</td>
<td>1,751,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Walkway</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Walkway</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Plaza Area (Lot 1 only) incl. Tyee/Harbour/Esquimalt connections</td>
<td>1,194,500</td>
<td>1,194,500</td>
<td>1,194,500</td>
<td>1,194,500</td>
<td>1,194,500</td>
<td>1,194,500</td>
<td>1,194,500</td>
<td>1,194,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access on lot 4</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>163,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Road/Pedestrian/ Pervious Parking for Industrial Areas</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>373,030</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>42,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Tree Planting (site 1,2,3,4)</td>
<td>19,450</td>
<td>280,250</td>
<td>365,700</td>
<td>280,250</td>
<td>365,700</td>
<td>365,700</td>
<td>365,700</td>
<td>365,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galloping Goose Trail/Harbour Rd Upgrades (Lot 1, Lot 4)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waterfront Dock Area and small boat launch (Lot 4)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreshore/ shoreline Enhancement/Port Ellice Park</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PlayArea(lot 1)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Racks (all lots on grade)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canals &amp; Minitransit</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical, Aboriginal &amp; Environmental Signage on site</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Treatment</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidization wood waste to power</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Technologies</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Center</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Washroom</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Amenities</td>
<td>- 1,884,300</td>
<td>4,826,030</td>
<td>383,250</td>
<td>- 536,530</td>
<td>- 870,850</td>
<td>977,530</td>
<td>9,378,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Costs</td>
<td>- 4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Costs</td>
<td>- 4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Victoria: 2005
Another non-traditional requirement made by the City of Victoria was that it negotiated for the provision and the improvement of public amenities and affordable housing in the first phase of the development project. By doing so, Dockside Green ensured that public interest would take precedence and also that the public amenities would be established without putting a strain on the public infrastructure within the surrounding neighbourhood. Shearing (2017) commented on this by stating:

.... unlike any development that I have ever been associated with, the delivery of sustainability pieces, [such as] wastewater treatment plant, district energy system, parks—any of these amenities associated with the development had dates attached to them. So, October 14, 2014, you will deliver this... Well, development doesn’t work that way. Development is market driven and so to have set dates for delivery of a district energy system is—it doesn’t set the development up to succeed (interview, 2017).

The MDA (2005) posed various problems and the developers faced challenges in meeting the deadlines. By October 2010, the City of Victoria Council was notified of the delay in provision of the final 25% of amenities. With the project now lagging, both the developer and the City of Victoria decided to go back to the drawing board and re-strategize the project. They also chose to redraft some of the timelines stipulated for the outstanding amenities.

According to the Dockside Green Neighbourhood Update (2016), to date 75% of the amenities have been met (Figure 6) with 25% of the site’s development having been completed. The most notable achievements are completion of the sewage wastewater treatment, the environmental remediation of the site, and the removal of hazardous materials on site. Some of the completed amenities that were listed in Schedule D included the bike racks, the green way, public art, car-share, environmental signage on site, the waterfront dock area and small boat launch, and improvement of the Galloping Goose Trail. However, most of the public amenities have not been completed. These include the sustainability centre, main plaza, play area, main plaza, and the public transit that goes through Dockside Green, including the mini transit system. Figure 6 shows the completion of the first two phases. Part of the remainder of the site is currently being used as an urban agriculture site. The figure also shows the completion of the affordable housing component and the biomass energy system. The current study aims, therefore, to analyse social sustainability as it relates to the completed part of the development.
Prior to development of Dockside Green

Current state of Dockside Green (2019)

Credit: City of Victoria (2002)

Credit: Google Earth (2019)

Figure 6: The progress of development at Dockside Green

4.3. Impact of 2008 market downturn on development process

At the end of the first phase, Dockside Green seemed to be on track in meeting its goals and adhering to the MDA. This included receiving the highest LEED certification for the neighbourhood (scoring 63 out of 70). Dockside was able to deliver its construction on budget on time. At the time that the business case was conceptualized, and the developer bid for the project, the market demand was healthy, and the investor anticipated making a profit on the development investment. In a healthy market and positive economic conditions, rising land values support the obligations that are set as deliverables by sustainable development plans (Marsh, 2010).

However, in negative economic conditions or following a sharp decline in economic conditions, a decrease in the value of existing land means that it is a challenge for development obligations to be met. An economic downturn has negative implications for the deliverables of social sustainability outcomes, including public amenities (Marsh, 2010). In addition, by implication, demand for housing also decreases because of reduced lending for home buyers.

In the case of Dockside Green, no-one foresaw the economic downturn that would transpire when the MDA was drafted. The market downturn was an unanticipated event for both the city and the developer. In 2008, the global financial crisis had adverse
effects on the housing market, resulting in the slowing of the development process. According to the Canada West Foundation (CWF 2012: 35), which quoted the former director of Dockside Green, Carola Bloedorn, the timing of the project was critical. Bloedorn was quoted as saying “Dockside Green was planned as a ten year build out, but we couldn’t have foreseen the extent of the economic troubles that have come.”

Another important factor that worsened the Dockside Green situation was the terms of the development/amenity schedule, which highlighted that most of the amenities were to be provided at the start of the project, with certain specified timeframes. The developer experienced financial challenges when the market crashed due to the major infrastructural investments which would only pay off when the site was completely built out. Robert Brown from Catalyst echoed the sentiments of Deborah Curran, a researcher on Dockside Green:

And for a variety of reasons including, in my opinion, some planning that could have been done better as far as staggering infrastructure cost. So they had the district energy, the wastewater treatment plant—all of which was put in the front end, based on the entire buildout with the project. And ideally, if that could have phased as the project developed, it would have been lot more financially feasible. And then there was a lot of stuff that was done that put extra cost burden on project. Which was fine, as long as the market was continuing to do that and condo prices were going up. But then when condo prices just stopped and even dropped in 2007-2008, the whole project kind of basically stopped (Interview, 2017).

It was evident that the provision of amenities was largely reliant on economic conditions and the financial viability of the development (Marsh, 2010). The decrease in demand and decline in construction led to discouragement within the housing sector. In addition, development projects were dependent on different variables that included not only the priorities set in the budget but also all the market conditions, political figures, and the local policies and strategies. Therefore, the necessary compromise might also neglect social sustainability outcomes.

Joe Van Belleghem and Windmill sold their shares in Dockside Green to Vancity and left the partnership. The market downturn precipitated failure in the partnership between Vancity and Windmill. In the wake of the breakdown in the partnership, Vancity (the remaining developer), took a break in the development. With only 25 % of the
project completed, Vancity was left with the burden of developing the remaining 75%. Curran provided some clarification on the breakup of the partnership:

This is a failing of... they got caught by the subprime mortgage collapse in 2007 to 2009. And then Joe Van Belleghem left. And so the charismatic mega funded developer who’s carrying this entire thing on his personality left. And then the City, who’s not a developer ... suddenly is this sole owner and they have been twiddling their thumbs and going “what are we going to do?” for the last decade (Interview, 2017).

Phase 2, Balance, was completed in 2009. With the visionary of the project gone, Wardle (Interview, 2018) stated that, “they weren’t able to feel so confident that they would ever find someone to develop the site”. According to the Dockside Green Annual Report (2011), the developer highlighted that they would be evaluating the housing market and the development of Dockside Green. The developer also noted that they were being ‘prudent’ in their assessment of the market and would start a new phase of development when the Victoria market became conducive (Dockside Green, 2011).

Being prudent in the next phase of development highlights a neoliberal approach. The original plans were based on the condition that there would be continuous growth of the housing market. With the 2008 market downturn, the project failed to meet its obligations and also missed the scheduling and the deadlines that were set up in the MDA (2005). With Windmill withdrawing from the partnership, the project could be classified as a disappointment, especially from the developer’s perspective, as it also left Windmill bankrupt. This also showed the challenges associated with neoliberalism. The plan was meant to fit into the growth oriented neoliberal framework.

Despite the failure to meet all the obligations as outlined in the MDA (2005), the City of Victoria did not instate any penalties or seek to punish the developer for not delivering the amenities by the expected date.

The above account illustrates that the city had to make a compromise by not pursuing penalties. The economic downturn in 2008 clearly placed pressure on the city to be lenient when a developer fell short in meeting obligations, as outlined in the development agreement. It acted with the understanding that the agreement would not be workable or feasible in an economic downturn. Hence some of the obligations had to be deferred until the economy improved. It was not until eleven years later that construction of affordable housing (Madrona) commenced, led by Catalyst. This shows that Dockside Green subjugated affordable housing to profitability. The case study
shows that the attainment of social sustainability was dependent on economic performance. However, this clearly compromised development commitments and social sustainability goals were not attained. This also highlights that market conditions dictated when the social sustainability amenities that were outlined in the MDA (2005) would be provided.

4.4. Challenges associated with development of sustainable neighbourhoods

4.4.1. Evolution of sustainability

As mentioned in Section 4.2, the terms of the MDA (2005) were never meant to be changed. However, factors that comprised sustainability evolved over the time period of Dockside Green, not only in terms of the innovation and technology aspects, but also the social aspects of sustainability. With the rapid development of technology, legal agreements and processes were ultimately also affected as statutes lagged behind the development of technology. Curran explained how local governments started to implement different legal agreements which might also incorporate sustainability. She stated that she was:

.....sceptical...about the role that these kinds of legal agreements can play on an ongoing basis, in supporting change towards sustainable development. But, on the other hand, isn’t it also true that cities are more willing, and developers maybe too will be more willing to experiment with different kinds of legal agreements. (Interview, 2017)

Another key theme linked to social justice which emerged from the interviews was the evolution of sustainability and the changes in technology over the years. Technological innovation is appealing to consumers. However, improved technology in later years may result in technological products becoming more advanced and the price of technology can drop. Sustainability initiatives at Dockside Green initially focused on the technology and the environmental aspects of sustainability. At the time, Shearing stated that “I believe at the end of the project we will see technology that we don’t even know about yet” (Heiman, October 13, 2006). Dockside Green was conceptualized in a period (early 2000s) where sustainability and sustainability innovation and technology were still in their early stages of development. Sustainability standards were constantly being updated and continuously evolving. In the case of Dockside Green’s commitment
to LEED certification, at the time the MDA (2005) was conceptualised, LEED was still relatively new. Thus, Dockside Green was LEED-ND certified during its pilot phase. Alexa Konopaki, former development coordinator for Dockside Green explained this as follows:

... ..... green building—it’s a technology that constantly evolves. And, like, we kind of like to compare it to, like, a television. If you were in 2005 and you bought this state-of-the-art television and every person in Dockside was going to get the best, you know, the most expensive state of the art television at that time, well, ten years later that television might be a little bit out of date. And better—not better, but more advanced—technology that maybe wasn’t available at that time would be available now. That’s kind of how the LEED system—I mean in my view—works: is that over time the technology changes. What you know was LEED before Gold now basically is standard and is essentially what platinum was in 2005. It’s a rating system, it’s fluctuated and what was noted as the best at in 2005 is now shifted. There’s actually better ways to do things. So, it—there was a bit of a, yeah, an adjustment that everybody had to get used to. It’s not a system that a lot of people are used to working with, so the complexity of the LEED components, green building components.... (Interview, 2017)

The current case study also illustrates the changes in technology over the time. Around 2005, the building of infrastructure was a more expensive exercise. Later, it became cheaper than when Dockside Green was built. Lee went on to say:

.....here is a perception by the development community that oh boy this is really expensive to do, when in fact if you probably run the numbers now it’s probably not at all and I think it’s just, you know, resetting kind of Dockside’s reputation on the way as a you know as we move forward in the new phases you know there is you know this is utilizing systems that can be economically viable and I think that if we look at this few years now as a case study it’s going to look very different to me than it did ten years ago... (Interview, 2017)

The innovation or ‘cutting edge’ came with a hefty price tag. However, as that same technology and innovation infiltrated and subsequently flooded the market, expanding and improving along the way, prices dropped, resulting in a major loss for the developer. Clearly, some of the amenities were not delivered due to the strain on the budget. The wastewater treatment plant was a good example: “I think if you were to do that ten years later it would be a lot cheaper now than it would have been at the time,” (Lee, interview, 2017).
The market-driven approach can also be linked to how environmental sustainability has evolved in the past ten years. Some of the sustainability features were viewed as high-end and were often expensive. For example, electricity meters, were not as common and were also more expensive at the time they were introduced at Dockside Green. Taken in today’s context, these would have depreciated. As Curran explained:

.. they put in all the high-end fixtures and so it’s actually quite expensive, not very, but it’s quite expensive for the Victoria market, even at this point in time. So because they chose to go high end, because of the location, in anticipation of, you know, gaining significant market appreciation, what they did was—you are paying a premium for LEED and so you need to have the certification in order to maintain that cachet and that premium to pay that amount... (Interview, 2017).

The view of social sustainability has also evolved over time. In the case of Dockside Green, there was more emphasis on the environmental aspects and on being the most innovative project. In order to appeal to the market, Dockside Green largely used its environmental features and thus prioritised these goals. However, these values have also changed over time. Lee explained that the notions and concepts of sustainability have evolved over time. There has been a cultural shift, in which there has been increasing attention paid to social sustainability beyond just the environmental sustainability component. Lee explained:

Eleven years later and the values have changed. You know, the perspective of how we engage with the community, and how we focus more perhaps on social responses, social sustainability beyond just environmental sustainability, was a real opportunity for us to engage with the public, engage with the stakeholder (Interview, 2017).

This suggests that by engaging with the public and the stakeholder, participatory democracy and social justice are also important in the development of a sustainable community. Therefore, in order to accomplish economic competitiveness at Dockside Green, and also environmental efficiency and innovation, it becomes equally important to engage the community in the environmental process. Konopaki supported the above sentiments expressed by Lee, stating that:

I think the other thing is that sustainability, the concept of it has changed in the past ten years. You know, it's not just about building green. It's about the economic factors of it, the cultural factors, how we all kind of intertwined into that concept of sustainability and how it's ultimately up to us to keep that going in the years ahead (Interview, 2017).
Lee’s comments highlight that not only the economic factors relating to sustainability are of importance. The concept of sustainability is interconnected with other sustainability components which should be taken into consideration. Ultimately in moving ahead with the Dockside Green project, there is the need to balance the economic, social and environmental components. This has also been reflected in the new thinking, and how Dockside currently envisions sustainability: “A well-loved, culturally vital neighbourhood where the mix of people and environment fuels health and a vibrant local economy” (Dockside Green, 2014: 4).

4.4.2. Complexity of the MDA (2005)

The development of any private piece of land is a complicated process. Within any neoliberal system, development is dependent on the political and economic conditions of the area. When local government officials and developers embark on the development process, they both come to the table with different outcomes or goals in mind. The Master Development Agreement is thus used by the local government as a means for a more collaborative approach, so that both parties can have intended outcomes documented. This collaborative process requires organization among different stakeholders and guarantees that common goals are achieved. The Dockside Green MDA (2005) highlights the complexity of such developments and their vulnerability to unpredictable future conditions.

As highlighted in Section 4.3., the unanticipated 2008 market downturn contributed to the complexity of achieving the outcomes set out in the MDA (2005). In order to make the project viable and to make sure that the development continued and advanced, the City of Victoria was willing to be flexible over the conditions stipulated within the MDA (2005) to reduce the complexity of the project. Amenities as listed in Schedule D of the MDA (2005) were provided at the start of the project instead of during the course of the project building process. This strained the funding of the project and therefore compromised its development (CWF, 2012).

In conventional developments, municipal requirements are typically delineated in the by-laws. However in green developments, legal intricacy arises from the way in which standards are laid out in various documents, guidelines and agreements (Curran, interview, 2017). At Dockside, the MDA formed the foundation of the commitments that
the developer and the City of Victoria had to abide by. Over time, the responsibility, accountability and enforcement mechanisms became blurred (Curran, 2016). It was stipulated that the developers had to provide monitoring reports every year for the development process, which would gauge their progress and establish if they were meeting their targets. However, they stopped providing the reports after the completion of phase 1.

With complexity also comes flexibility, as in the case of Dockside Green. With the 2008 market downturn, and the failure of Dockside Green to meet its obligations, the project lost its charm and the novelty that it had at the onset of the project. Therefore, Dockside Green had to come up with a means to revitalise itself; this required the reinvention and redefinition of the vision for the site. It also required the revision of the MDA (2005) and a change of goals, thus creating a renewed vision for Dockside Green. The new MDA highlighted the flexibility that existed and reflected the changes that could occur with the planning of the neighbourhood. Thus, legal agreements could be challenged on an ongoing basis when supporting change for sustainable development. This also affected how the neighbourhoods would interpret social sustainability over time. In addition, when sustainable development and the MDA were framed within British Common Law, they did not allow for changes in the sustainability technologies or initiatives that might occur over time. This could affect the nature of the buildings and how they were governed over time (Curran, interview, 2017).

**Enforcement/monitoring of the MDA (2005) obligations**

Despite the MDA (2005) being legally enforceable, the nature of the MDA (2005) made it difficult for public officials to monitor and enforce the obligations that were stipulated in the MDA. As highlighted in 4.2, one of the stipulated guidelines for the MDA (2005) was the continuous monitoring and review of whether Dockside Green met its obligations for the project. On the part of the City, this would ensure that its interests were protected and would reduce the risk that the developer would not meet the obligations. Dockside Green was required to provide a sustainability report annually. The ongoing monitoring of the project was of great concern to the City of Victoria. As a neighbourhood that was seen as a model for sustainability, the City of Victoria was also eager to analyze the impact of Dockside Green on the greater areas of the city and the surrounding neighbourhoods.
The annual review of Dockside Green was stipulated in the MDA (2005) to ensure that the developer was in compliance with its obligations. The city staff were also required to monitor compliance by ensuring that the developer adhered to the deadlines stipulated in the agreement and adhered to the schedule of payment of administrative costs to the City of Victoria. The first annual report was released in 2006. This Sustainable Report set out the progress of the projects stated as TBL goals, including the successes, failures and challenges which the project faced. These reports were regularly submitted during the first phase of the project (2006 to 2008). However, in phase two, this was no longer the case. From 2009, the developer opted to provide a shorter summary report (Dockside Green, 2013). Within the first phase of development, most of the innovations were introduced (e.g. wastewater plant treatment, water and energy reduction). Therefore, there was more enthusiasm early on about publicly tracking the achievements and measuring the success of the projects; subsequently this was lost.

With the progression of the projects, the reports became redundant after a year as there was no further development and the status update remained the same as the previous year. Although accountability procedures in the provision of public amenities were stated in the MDA (2005), in practice it was left unclear as to how the enforcement would be instituted. This has been a criticism of the City of Victoria in that it was unable to hold the developer accountable. Therefore, there was underlying pressure on the City of Victoria to intensify its drive to ensure that the developer was in compliance. Curran described how environmental standards were not necessarily enforced unless they posed a threat to residents:

I just don’t see that, for a lot of environmental stuff, unless you have a watchdog there’s really not anything that’s going on, so that the owners... but they might be self-interested in not maintaining the sustainability aspect of it. And then you have the City who, it will never rise to the surface because the only thing they enforce are danger and criminal kind of activity. Right, so unless there’s some real influx of money, such that they would hire a specialist who would do the monitoring for them on an annual basis, they are simply not going to do that (Interview, 2017).

Curran’s analysis suggests that the monitoring and enforcement of the obligations was not a priority. The City of Victoria did not have the capacity to monitor
the implementation of the Dockside Green project in order to understand the project in its full context.

The evolution of what is regarded as sustainability complicates enforcement and poses a challenge in monitoring sustainability over time. According to Curran, the legal agreements were not necessarily used for monitoring and reporting. The use of property law to fix responsibilities or entitlements keeps them there in time, they were fixed at a certain point of time and they were meant not to change. The MDA (2005), as a legal requirement, did not account for changes that might occur in the future. Curran explained this further:

... that what we are doing is that you take property laws, ... fixed in time and you are trying to insert sustainability into it, which has to change over time. And to, you know, if we want to monitor and improve buildings and stuff over time, it needs to improve. Property law simply doesn’t do that. So a more appropriate mechanism might be something like a combination of bylaws and strata property rules (Interview, 2017).

The updating and amending of the MDA (2005) became essential in order to keep up with the changes that occurred over time. Weak enforcement of the MDA obligations highlights the complexity of the MDA and the deficit in institutional capacity of the local government. Therefore, the case study indicates that, in the absence of a stringent monitoring system, the developer compromised the delivery of public amenities.

**Flexibility of the MDA (2005)**

This case study highlights the limitations that the local government faced in monitoring the outcomes of the MDA (2005). As a consequence, the process took a more flexible approach, in which local government reduced some of its stringent requirements and renegotiated the terms of the MDA (2005). In order to promote creativity and innovation within the urban neoliberal context, the local government assumed a flexible approach. This approach was seen as a means of enhancing efficiency of the market. However, the local government was also obligated to satisfy public interest through the implementation of social goals (OECD, 2017).

The above section shows that the City of Victoria took a flexible approach in trying to be an enabling government bent on facilitating and ensuring optimum conditions that allowed the private developer to have a viable project and also to attract investment. The flexibility approach instituted in the planning strategies reflected an entrepreneurial
approach to governance. In addition, the flexibility approach emphasized the loosening of rules and provision of guidance in the development process and not necessarily prescribing a course of action (Tasan-Kok, 2008).

With the MDA (2005), Dockside Green was unable to provide the public amenities and failed to meet the deadlines that were outlined in the Development/Amenity Schedule. However, the effect of the market downturn was not accounted for in the agreement. Had this been included in the MDA (2005), the City of Victoria would have had better control when the downturn occurred. Instead of enforcing the commitments in the MDA, the city loosened the rules in the provision of amenities and extended the project.

With the market downturn having negative repercussions for the site, the need for a flexible approach was essential in ensuring that the developers were not further disadvantaged. It also ensured that the site would remain marketable and prosperous and that the agreement on amenities would be met. Thus, in the case of Dockside Green, despite the expectation that the developer would meet the social sustainability obligations and that the City would not have to bear those costs, the City took a more relaxed approach in the face of the market downturn and did not impose any penalties when the developer failed to meet the social sustainability objectives.

Changes that were occurring within the greater context of the City of Victoria since 2002 also played a role in the adoption of the flexibility approach. In particular, the city’s downtown area underwent extensive development and there were some changes in the development and construction industries.

The amendment of the MDA reflects negotiative networks (also referred to as the ‘negotiative land-use planning’). As highlighted in the literature review, the role of the neoliberal government is as an enabler of the private sector, reducing restrictions on success. Therefore, flexibility is progressively desirable in order to handle the fast-changing dynamics of a capitalist urban development (Tasan-Kok, 2008).

However, in some of the relevant literature, flexibility is given a negative connotation as it implies that there is a shifting in the target and plan set by the initial agreement. This highlights that there is a concern that flexibility approaches “undermine
the primary goal of planning to balance the public and private interest” (Tasan-Kok, 2008, 187).

For Dockside Green, the revision of the MDA (2005) was critical in that it ensured that, with the changes in the concept of sustainability over the years and the market downturn, the flexibility in the planning of urban development within the neoliberal context encouraged greater viability and urban economic regeneration. The urban development process was subject to market priorities. In addition, flexibility allowed the site to evolve, and to be reinvented and reimagined, and thereby to be competitive within the neoliberal system.

4.5. Amendment of the MDA (2016)

At its core, sustainability at Dockside Green was more focused on the environmental pillar, with less emphasis on the economic and social pillars. At the time of writing, there were limited common spaces at Dockside Green. These included the public walkways and the public square outside the café. Within the context of the City of Victoria, the city did not make any provision for amenity spaces. Despite the challenges that were faced in the implementation of the MDA (2005), the City of Victoria had some control. The case study shows that the City made some attempts to enforce the MDA (2005), as highlighted in the previous section (4.4.2). However, with the market downturn, the developer was in a negative financial situation coupled with bankruptcy, and the breakdown in the Windmill and Vancity partnership led to the developer failing to meet its obligations. When the developer did not meet the requirements set out in the MDA (2005), the City of Victoria took a flexible approach, as highlighted above. It allowed for the redrafting the MDA, resulting in a revised version of the initial MDA. The amendment of the MDA highlighted the changes in the vision for the site, in the market mechanism and in how sustainability was viewed.

Before the market downturn, the developer promised various amenities on the site, such as affordable housing and public spaces. Although there was some frustration due to the slow pace of the development of the site, the major criticism that the site faced was that it had failed to meet the social sustainability requirements, which included affordable housing (Dale & Newman, 2009). In addition, sentiments were aired to the effect that Dockside Green had private amenities that were benefitting the rich and not
necessarily everyone. For example, the green roofs in Synergy and Inspiration were accessible only to the individuals who lived in the building. Not meeting or providing adequate amenities at the site represented broken promises and a failure to meet the expectations of the general public. Shearing explained the situation as follows:

Well, I would say that coming into it—I mean, lot of people would have said that it was a failed project because it languished for so long. While other developers and developments were retooled and reorganized, you know, from 2009 and were under development in the city process of getting approval. And Dockside Green was sort of this unrealized dream. So, I would say that lot of people thought of it being a failed project. Others didn’t think that Vancity would, you know, move to the completion of this (Interview, 2017).

The project was at a standstill for about seven years, during which time the developer was left with the challenge of how to move forward with the project while meeting the conditions of the MDA (2005). Ally Dewji the development manager for Dockside Green, in a letter to the City of Victoria highlighted the importance of revisiting the MDA (2005):

As an early adopter of sustainable development, Dockside Green has been recognized as one of the greenest communities of North America. We have, however, also experienced many challenges. Innovation means taking risks and learning from being at the leading edge of the “green building movement”. Much has changed in the ten years since the project was first launched in 2005 and we need to revisit some of the early thinking to test whether what was originally envisioned is still relevant today and reflects the needs and aspirations of the evolving local community in 2015 and beyond (Dewji, letter to the City of Victoria, February 19 2015).

After the market downturn and the stalling of the project, Dockside Green held consultations with the community to redefine its vision for sustainability. In 2016, Dockside Green proposed an updated neighbourhood plan and an amendment to the MDA (2005). During this process, the City of Victoria still had leverage with the developer and could guide the development process of the site.

Community members voiced their discontent with the proposed amendments of the MDA (2005). A long-time resident at Dockside Green expressed her frustration for the lack of progress over the years, holding the developer accountable for not meeting its obligations:
My husband and I moved to Victoria West in 2004, when Dockside Green was just an idea. We were elated that this innovative community, by description, was going to be our neighbor. We watched with pride as the first phases of Dockside became a reality. Work stopped in 2009 and for the last seven years, there has been no further construction on the Dockside site. Our community gateway has been a barren, fence-in, weed-covered slope. The recent food trucks, art installations and dialogue events have only been realized lately, and in “activating the site” we are not distracted enough to forget that there has been no progress for so many years. I urge Mayor and Council to hold Dockside Green to the highest standard in realizing the full potential of the original vision that was promised to the City and its Citizens. Dockside Green must also be held accountable for their actions and their false claims. Dockside Green must come clean.

Other community members also corroborated what the above community member expressed and demanded that the City of Victoria reject the rezoning of the site:

...request you take action regarding the Dockside Green fiasco. I am referring to the failure of Vancity to fulfill their obligations and now the opportunity for the city to do the right thing and reject the request for rezoning and seize the moment and exercise their option to buy back the land.

In addition, initially, there were some reservations on the part of some of the city councillors. Councillor Pamela Madoff, quoted by CBC (2017), stated that:

When I first heard there was a desire to reopen the master development agreement, I had to admit as someone that had been there from the very beginning, my heart really sank, but I can say to this point the principles that I think are most important have remained consistent through the changes.

With the recognition that the initial MDA (2005) had failed to meet its obligations and to provide for amenities, some community members supported the amendment of the MDA for the following reasons:

....am hopeful that the full development will bring vibrancy to our neighbourhood, including more community amenities.

Another community member agreed that the new plan would be beneficial for the community and also emphasised the importance of getting the project completed:

As residents of Balance, Dockside Green, we are impressed with the planning, building standards, and commitment to green space as outlined in the new neighbourhood plan for Dockside. We feel that the
implementation of the plan and launching the completion will be beneficial to our neighbourhood; let's get it done! (Community member feedback, January 23, 2017).

The Building Resilient Neighbourhoods Project also supported the new Master Development Plan for Dockside Green by expressing the following:

I believe Dockside Green’s proposed new Master Development Plan illustrates the underlying values they have related to community sustainability and resilience, and we are excited to see this move forward. In particular, the plan’s emphasis on public space, fostering opportunities for greater social connectedness amongst neighbours, supporting local economic development, and enhanced urban green space are all important contributors to community resilience we would hope to see in more neighbourhoods across the region (Community member feedback, January 23, 2017).

Curran added that, as long as the site was still within the sustainability principles and with limited deviation from the MDA (2005), it would be approved:

..for the vast majority of local governments, unless something really egregious is happening, they just want to get the neighbourhood going. So as long as it’s not complete deviation on what they agreed to, they are willing to let it go forward (Interview, 2017).

The City of Victoria did not oppose any of the proposed changes and was eager to see the project being revived. The proposed amendments to the MDA (2005) entailed an increase in the public amenities. There were also additional infrastructural updates made to the MDA (2005), including a new public park, a plaza and new mobility hubs (Dockside Green, 2016). The new plans represented an increase in open spaces from an initial 2.65 ha to the proposed 3.1 ha.

The amendment of the MDA (2005) can be said to have been influenced by market mechanisms. Although the development was sustainability-oriented, it was also market driven. The site was considered to be financially unsustainable and developers lost money (Shearing, interview, 2017). This posed a challenge to achieve the sustainability goals of the site. Developers paid a premium for the sewage treatment plant and the district energy, which utilised leading edge technology, and they had to rethink the development of the remaining 75% of the site (Lui, interview, 2017).

The initial plan would have been successful if market conditions had continued to be attractive and if there had been a high market demand. However, when the market
downturn occurred, the plan became unsustainable and could not withstand the harsh market conditions. This was the main lesson for the developers. Rather than having the amenities built at the start of the entire project; the amenities should have been phased in as the project developed and thus would have been more financially feasible (Brown, interview, 2018). In order to be profitable as private developers, they had to re-strategize their approach to sustainability.

Certain features from the original MDA (2005) remain the same. These include the commitment to LEED ND Platinum certification, the inclusion of public amenities, mixed-use neighbourhood, and the same density. Importantly, the commitment of Dockside in adhering to LEED certification has not wavered. Thus, as Shearing declared, “the DNA of the development was maintained” and:

I would say that major one is just the LEED platinum, you know, obligation. All the other pieces are still there, those haven’t gone anywhere. We moved away from tying delivery of parks and playgrounds and other amenities to dates; you know, they are associated with the development ... (Interview, 2017).

Section 4.4.1 considered how, as the evolution of LEED and of sustainability continued, it also became difficult to monitor sustainability, despite it being embedded in the MDA (2005). Therefore, it also became critical to renegotiate the MDA (2005). This view was also expressed by Curran, who stated that:

..... a couple of actors come into play with that, so the master agreement was signed before that requirement for ongoing monitoring in. Was built into the LEED standard itself then. So Dockside Green is fixed in time with Platinum LEED back in 2005. So that’s a problem from an ongoing sustainability perspective. So that was a developer move, so that they knew what their playing field was. And they had it in their playing field that they understood, unless they went back and renegotiated it. (Interview, 2017).

Derek Lee, principal landscape architect, also supported Shearing regarding the importance of LEED certification and pointed out how the site focus on the LEED ND evaluated the neighbourhood as a whole. The first phase of Dockside Green focused on the green building certification system designed for existing buildings, with defined performance criteria and metrics (Holden et al., 2015). LEED-ND certification considered the neighbourhood scale of sustainability. LEED–ND evolved from the planning and development approach of new urbanism, smart growth concepts that promote walkable
and compact neighbourhoods, and mixed-use developments. They thereby acted as guides for sustainable neighbourhood development (Jackson, 2003). Lee explained the amendment from LEED to LEED-ND:

....the biggest difference of course from, you know, the first couple phases was that of course that was really focused on, you know, the energy and recycling of resources. That’s all happening. But the way we are measuring now is through LEED ND. It’s the neighbourhood development which I think we are going for— is it either gold or platinum? And the feeling was that rather than certifying NC for each new development site, this would give us a bit more flexibility for a more balanced and holistic approach to the planning and development, knowing that LEED ND (Interview, 2017).

In order to have an amended MDA, Dockside Green had to provide for affordable housing which it was not able to adequately deliver, nor could it meet its obligations.

The amendment of the MDA (2005) was necessary in order to adapt to change in the market conditions. This highlighted how projects have to respond not only to market conditions, but also to social and political structures, while still remaining competitive within the neoliberal system. Ally Dewji, director of development for Dockside Green, was quoted in the Douglas magazine as saying:

The market has changed substantially even in the two or three years of our recent process...The old plan was only achievable in a positive market; some of the buildings had 200 units. We needed to turn them into 80 to 120 units — a building scale deliverable in a regular market, where it’s all based on pre-sales. So now the plan allows for this (Paterson, 2017).

These amendments highlight the re-envisioning of social sustainability which included the increase in the number of social spaces that promote social interaction and inclusion. In 2017, the City approved rezoning for Dockside Green. Consequently, the amendment of the MDA also highlighted how Dockside Green has evolved as well as how social sustainability is currently being defined on the site.

4.6. Chapter summary

This chapter provides the context and the development process of Dockside Green within the neoliberal neighbourhood development. In this study, the City of Victoria took an entrepreneurial approach to redeveloping formerly industrialized land. It
applied market-based economic principles to the urban development policies and planning. Therefore, the City of Victoria was not inclined to develop the land, rather it opted to sell the property to a private developer that would use the triple bottom line approach to development. However, in this instance, social equity concerns were not fully addressed and were sidelined by the neighbourhood neoliberal policies that promoted an entrepreneurial agenda. The case study shows the challenges that local government officials faced as they planned for social sustainability strategies in neighbourhoods. Despite embracing social sustainability goals that promoted equity and social cohesion, the MDA (2005) plan lacked strong enforcement mechanisms for achieving the social sustainability goals that were defined in the MDA (2005).

The case study also highlights that the project was impacted by market conditions that affected the delivery of social sustainability components. The economic downturn and the change in the market conditions led the project to the brink of failure and its subsequent stalling. After the market downturn, Dockside Green became very cautious in how to proceed with the development of the site. It also had to consider the external risks facing the projects. In addition, with the evolution of the drive for sustainability, Dockside Green realized that there was a need for more emphasis on social sustainability Thus, Dockside Green had to revisit the original MDA.
Chapter 5. Balancing neoliberal processes and social sustainability outcomes at Dockside Green

This section explores the neoliberal processes of development at Dockside Green and their implication for social sustainability outcomes. The previous section highlighted some of the challenges that Dockside Green faced in the development process, how neoliberalism shaped that process, and how the City of Victoria enabled and facilitated the developer in implementing innovative and entrepreneurial strategies on the site. This section expands on the achievement of the social sustainability goals in the development of Dockside Green.

The literature review provided a foundation for analysis of the extent to which Dockside Green has been able to meet social sustainability imperatives. The comparison of the characteristics of social sustainability and neoliberal models highlights the tension that might exist in trying to balance the differing imperatives. Market-driven policies i.e. privatization, individualism or entrepreneurialism, leave the city with the challenging task of balancing the competitiveness agenda (focusing on individualism) with the provision of public amenities, which focus on the collective goals which also safeguard social cohesion within neighbourhoods.

This section also uses the evaluation criteria highlighted in the literature in Section 2.5 as a means of assessing social sustainability factors evident in the development, including public amenities, social inclusion, connectivity and sense of place at Dockside Green. It evaluates how successful Dockside Green has been in achieving the social sustainability requirements that were clearly set out in the MDA (2005).

5.1. Neoliberal strategies at Dockside Green

The neoliberal process at Dockside Green began when the City of Victoria made the decision to sell the land and transfer ownership of public owned land to a private developer. By implication, the transfer of the land ownership comes with the transfer of risk to the developer. In addition, the City of Victoria realized that by redeveloping the brownfield site, not only would this improve the quality of the environment, but it would also provide improved social conditions for the community.
When the private developer assumed ownership of the land, it also assumed the responsibility for the remediation process of the site and developing it into a sustainable community. In the case of Dockside Green, many other risks transferred to the new owners, including additional costs the site might face in the form of cost overruns and complying with regulations instituted by the government. The current development manager, Ally Dewji, was quoted by the CBC (2017): “When you're dealing with one building, it's a certain risk. When you're dealing with 12 buildings – like we had at Dockside – it becomes much more complicated”. This complication also included the operating costs associated with the project.

The market-oriented approach dictates the nature of the neoliberal urban development system. The City of Victoria regulated the land use, seen as a form of governmentality in that the city could use this opportunity to influence how the land was going to be developed. In this regard, the municipality also determined the goals and the vision – specifically the triple bottom line approach – at onset of the development process. Without this stipulation and control of the land use by the local government, the developers would have had the freedom to develop the site as they saw fit.

5.1.1. Negotiation of public interest vs private interest

This paper considers the role of the private developer and its capacity in the advancement of the public interest of a site. In many instances, where the local government is unable to meet the costs of providing public infrastructure, it relies on the private developer to provide for these services. When local government and private developer enter into an agreement – in this case Dockside Green and the developer, Vancity and Windmill – the pursuit of profits and the preservation of the public interests should be balanced. The consequence of carrying out programs with conflicting interests in the development of major amenities is that public interest is not considered in the provision of local amenities, as is apparent in the substantial cost overruns at Dockside Green. This highlights that, when conflicting interests are imposed on a site, i.e. private vs public interests, public interest will take a back seat compared to private interest that yields profits. However, this is not necessarily the case. Local government is obliged to make it a requirement for developers to provide social amenities. The City of Victoria was unable to force the developer to provide the public amenities, and this was pushed to a later date.
The current case study on Dockside Green shows that there are certain defects that are associated with neoliberal planning. The development process also highlighted how public and private interests often diverge. Ideally, public interest should take precedence over private interest. Private goals often aim to maximize profit, while public interest promotes the general interests of the people. Therefore, an important question arises when the privatisation of public land occurs. The case study highlighted that the City of Victoria faced some challenges in the upholding of public interest. As a green neighbourhood, Dockside Green should ensure that all three pillars of sustainability are balanced.

When Curran was asked about public interest in green neighbourhoods, she responded that: “For me the public interest resides somewhere between the owners and the city. I don’t think municipalities, although it is their role to uphold the public interest, I don’t think they are entirely capable of doing it” (Interview, 2017). She went on to say that no one entity should be the keeper of public interest but that rather it should be the responsibility of the residents, the municipality and the broader neighbourhood (in this case, the Vic West neighbourhood). She clarified this by stating that: “Vic West had a very big role in shaping what this was going to look like. [At] the public hearing and in their consultations before this proposal was put forward. And so they are sort of watching [that] it’s supposed to improve their neighbourhood too” (Interview, 2017).

5.1.2. Place-marketing and competitiveness agenda

The case study addresses place-marketing mechanisms implemented by the City of Victoria. Dockside Green lay dormant for years as a brownfield and contaminated site. It required the reimaging and transformation of the derelict space into a more economic, vibrant and attractive space. In the transformation of post-industrial spaces that were once subjugated to heavy industrial use, it is critical to integrate that space with rest of the urban landscape.

Place branding is used in the re-invention of the place to give it a distinctive character and identity. As a result of place-marketing strategies, Dockside Green is viewed in a more positive manner. Place-marketing is closely linked to sustainability. It takes into account the physical and social sustainability that contribute to the place being attractive to investors and buyers' visitors, thereby increasing the competitiveness of the
neighbourhood. In addition, it also contributes to the sense of place related to the uniqueness of that place. The notion of sense of place goes beyond the reputation of the place or its branding, both of which are dictated by the neoliberal system. Rather, it is related to the individual’s lived experience and how the surroundings are perceived. The distinct sense of place emerges from the physical infrastructure and how it relates to or impacts upon the social components.

A theme that emerged from the interviews and from the newspaper articles (specifically the Time Colonist), is that Dockside Green is not a traditional development, rather it is considered to be ‘distinct’ and ‘unique’. As a ‘unique’ asset for the City of Victoria, Dockside Green was viewed as a project that would enhance the image of the city. Using the neoliberal framework, it was an effective strategy to attract investment, along with the manner in which Dockside Green became a re-imagined site. In addition, the use of a big-name architectural firm, such as the world-renowned Perkins and Will, elevated how the project was viewed, and thus associated with innovative urban design.

In early 2000, there were no community development projects in Canada that were committed to high standards of sustainable development. The proposed development at Dockside Green was therefore also characterized as being “forward thinking” and representing a “visionary approach” (Mass, 2018). The vision for the development was put forward, especially by Joe van Belleghem from Windmill, as “distinctive” and one which would set Dockside Green apart. Dockside Green did benefit in the initial phase from having the City of Victoria as a champion.

Dockside Green was also meant to create an international showcase for development, having achieved the highest LEED certification in North America. LEED Platinum certification was achieved for Phase 1-Synergy and Phase 2-Balance and the commercial buildings, Inspiration and Prosperity. It was referred to as the “mecca for green development interests” (Heiman, December 8, 2006). This contributed to how Dockside Green branded and marketed itself to the rest of the world. Van Belleghem declared: “Environmental commitments help increase the marketability of our units” (Curtis, September 9, 2005).

As an entrepreneurial urban development for the City of Victoria, Dockside Green was a flagship development that would be used to gain a competitive advantage on the
global stage. As highlighted in the literature review, the neighbourhood was used as a platform for testing not only sustainability implementation, but also neoliberal policies. The project’s high commitment to sustainability, which included being the first neighbourhood to receive the highest LEED certification and becoming a model for water efficiency, has ultimately become the ‘signature’, or the distinct identity, of the development which has consequently been used as a place-marketing strategy.

The wastewater treatment site also contributed to Dockside Green’s distinctiveness. In this context, Dockside Green has attracted a lot attention, including various Canadian government officials such as Public Works, Natural Resources Canada and the CMHC. In addition, Dockside Green also hosted various municipalities and provided them with tours such as the Nelson, City of Vancouver, City of Calgary, City of Vancouver, FCM and Nanaimo FCM (Dockside Green, 2008, 2011). This provided an opportunity for visitors to learn about the development and about sustainable living, and to showcase what is possible within a sustainable neighbourhood and what it entails. Thus, the project assumed the role of a model for sustainable development.

Dockside Green is the only neighbourhood in the Greater Victoria area where wastewater is treated on-site. In the context of Victoria, sewage water treatment used to be a point of contention at a time when there was a lack of effective wastewater policies. In this context, the developers saw an opportunity to showcase new technologies for wastewater development and to reduce water and energy use. However, though successful in terms of environmental sustainability, Dockside Green did not meet its projected objectives and goals for meeting environmental and social equity requirements. In all its marketing strategies, Dockside Green did not address the social sustainability aspects. More emphasis was placed on innovation and less on how it would contribute to social equity. In focusing on the environmental innovation, social equity goals were subjugated and thus the developer failed to meet the social equity requirements.

Sustainability is seen as a brand that is associated with Dockside Green. Sustainability is intended to promote liveability and enhanced quality of life. This notion has become popular with investors, local businesses and consumers who are attracted to sustainable living. In this regard, Dockside Green also used LEED certification in order to enhance its brand. LEED has become the most recognized standard around the
world and more organizations are adopting it so as to acquire a brand recognition in order to be competitive in the global market (Cole and Jose Valdebenito, 2013). The LEED certification of any project is used as a marketing tool, thereby motivating developers to obtain LEED certification (Matisoff, 2014). Dockside Green’s values of sustainability appeal to the residents that choose to live there. For example, Eileen Seto, a resident at Dockside Green said: "Dockside just stood out as a unique community" and "Right from the start it has been designed around all of the values that are important to me" (Wilson, September 12, 2006).

Dockside Green is considered to have brought a sense of pride to the residents in the neighbourhood and the city as a whole. In 2009, when the City of Victoria won the Sustainable Community Award in the brownfield’s category for Dockside Green, the mayor at the time, Dean Fortin, was quoted as saying that “The City of Victoria is very proud of Dockside Green. This outstanding development has been a lesson in the art of the possible” and he went on to say, “Now is the time that sustainable development be seen as the norm, not the exception” (City of Victoria, 2009).

In short, the case study on Dockside Green was meant to represent a best practice-driven approach. The development project was also intended to be a sustainability model that could be replicated at other sites. As development was seen as an exception at the time, his comments represented what was possible for Dockside Green in terms of environmental sustainability. As the site won several awards in relation to environmental sustainability initiatives, all its accomplishments were put under the broad umbrella of sustainability, even though this was not necessarily social sustainability.
5.2. Evaluation of social sustainability goals at Dockside Green

The main emphasis of this study is on the importance of fully integrating social equity into neighbourhood development. Using Dockside Green as a case study, the study shows how mixed use and sustainable neighbourhoods and transportation networks can contribute to the attainment of social equity. This section evaluates the social sustainability objectives that were outlined in section 2.3. The literature review highlighted the theoretical background for social sustainability and the importance of just and inclusive communities.

5.2.1. Recognition/inclusion of First Nations

Reconciliation is an integral aspect in building inclusiveness and equitable communities. The reconciliation debate is critical in acknowledging and respecting the
implication this has for social inclusion, as stated in Section 2.3. In addition, Fainstein just city model (2010), also promotes diversity, which is the increase access for historically excluded populations. The process of reconciliation at Dockside Green recognizes that the historic conduct of and approach towards the Songhees Nation of the Lekwungen people should be acknowledged, as the consequences thereof will be felt for generations.

In the planning process of Dockside Green, Joe van Belleghem met with the First Nations people, including one of the chiefs. At the meeting he said the following to the First Nations people: “I really don’t know what you need. I’m a white guy, you know, and the reality is we contaminated the land. How about you help us heal it?” (Peakmoment, 2006). In so doing, the developers of Dockside Green recognized the Songhees Nation’s long history and their attachment to the site. It also recognized the impact of colonial history and the exclusion of the Songhees Nation. Dockside Green was able to establish and maintain a mutually respectful relationship with the First Nations as part of the reconciliation process.

As a consequence of the above recognition, at the onset of the project in 2006, the developer and the Songhees Nations signed a Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation and Communication. In addition to signing the memorandum, Joe van Belleghem reported that he met with the First Nations chief and his children and conducted a blessing ceremony at Dockside Green (Peakmoment, 2006). Subsequent to this, Dockside Green gave a pledge to the Nation to be responsible stewards of the land. Thus, steps were taken to build a relationship with the First Nations people, which was essential in moving forward with the project.

With this understanding in place, Dockside Green provided a First Nations job training program which facilitated work opportunities for First Nations people at Dockside Green, thereby providing employment to members of the Nation. This helped them gain skills and work experience, especially in trades and occupations which were essential in the long run. According to Dockside Green (2008), the First Nations Job Initiative led to the creation of 17 new jobs (i.e. 15% of the construction workforce) (Dockside Green, 2010) within the first phase of the development. The positions were mainly related to construction. However, this provision was not as successful as envisioned by the developers. In order for the initiative to be successful and sustainable in the long term,
the developers also required some additional long-term funding from the government. However, the developer was unable to secure the additional funding, which resulted in fewer First Nations people being trained than was hoped. In addition, the 2008 market downturn resulted in the slowing down of construction (Dockside Green, 2010).

Dockside Green has public art programs that showcase First Nations art pieces, including totems that are displayed on site (see Figure 8). This supports cultural redress and also acts as a means to celebrate and appreciate First Nations culture. This is also consistent with the social dimension of sustainable development (Dempsey et al., 2011). Cultural traditions are also an element of non-physical factors of social sustainability. In addition to addressing reconciliation, they generate awareness and appreciation of the culture and mean that the presence of First Nations people can be felt on the site.

![Dockside Green Songhees Nation Totem Pole](image)

*Figure 8: Dockside Green Songhees Nation Totem Pole*

Note: Photo by author, 2019
The art installation can be viewed as a means of influencing different aspects of the neighbourhood, including its physical, social and cultural identity. This assists with generating social cohesion, the non-physical factor of social dimensions (see Table 3) within the neighbourhood context. In this regard, Dockside Green can be commended for its recognition of the Songhees people and their inclusion in the development process. As a result of this, the First Nation provided enormous support to Dockside Green, including offering its support for an increase in height and density, and faster approval processes for the project (USGBC, 2013).

### 5.2.2. Affordable housing

The provision of affordable housing is aimed at increasing the social mix (i.e. mixing housing types and tenure). Social mix is a common strategy for reducing segregation (or spatial concentrations of extremely high-income or low-income households) and increasing social justice. Social mix has been actively employed in neighbourhood planning and development initiatives in the context of both neoliberal and socialist philosophies (Galster & Friedrichs, 2015). However, neoliberal policies in the housing sector promote unrestricted housing costs and price out low-income groups which leads to social injustice. Therefore, market mechanisms are unable to provide sufficient and equitable housing. Evidence also shows that in a public-private partnership it is often the case that very little affordable housing is provided (Taruvinga & Mooya, 2017).

In following Fainstein’s framework in section 2.3.2, planning and the promotion of equitable housing which state that new housing development should include housing for low income people. In addition, Dempsey et al. (2011) provided social dimensions of sustainable development including decent housing (see Table 3). Within the Dockside Green context, affordable housing was included in the MDA (2005). The developer’s initial proposal prior to the signing of the MDA (2005) was that affordable units would be 11% of 700 units. However, the developer changed the proposal and stated that providing 11% affordable housing was not economically feasible and would mean building smaller units. Instead the developer proposed to provide approximately a $3.5 mil contribution that would go towards the provision of affordable housing (Clarke, April 12, 2006). This alternative proposal was approved by the Council and was integrated into Section 9 of MDA (2005). With this change, the City of Victoria did not require a
certain number of housing units to meet an affordability threshold (Lee, interview, 2017). The Dockside Green Housing Advisory Committee was established, and later developed a Housing Affordability Strategy in 2006 which provided guiding principles on the implementation of the provision of affordable housing at Dockside Green.

The Housing Affordability Strategy was updated in 2008/09. The updates also set the target for the affordable housing to be 75 units, consisting of both the non-market and market affordable units. Within the first two phases of development, 26 market-rate affordable condominium units were provided within the existing towers – nine units in Synergy and 17 in Balance (Dockside Green, 2011). The developer provided a subsidy for this offering of approximately $920,000. Shearing explained the affordable units in Synergy and Balance as follows:

.... We have affordable home ownership units. And so those units were delivered maybe 15% below market, [with] a covenant on title that they have to—when they resell—have to be 15% below market. But we didn’t, it was less of a priority for the City and became less of a priority for us, because it complicates the land deal. And then there was discussion about peppering the affordable housing obligation through development on the site. As a land developer it complicates my land deals .... (Interview, 2017).

The table below (Table 9) shows the types of affordable housing units that were provided within the first phase of the development. The type of housing mostly comprised one bedroom and studio apartments which would not necessarily have been appropriate for a family. After the completion of the first two phases of the development, and the onset of the market downturn, the developer explored housing affordability strategies at Dockside Green. This included raising equity with partners outside of the affordable housing field who might aid in the construction of the non-market or affordable housing units (Dockside Green, 2008). In so doing, the developer adopted a neoliberal approach in order to provide for the housing. As a private developer, it had to be profitable and meet the affordable housing commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of development</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Type of housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Synergy</td>
<td>9 suites</td>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Balance</td>
<td>5 suites</td>
<td>Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Balance</td>
<td>12 suites</td>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the first two phases of the development there was also an expensive development. Living at Dockside was considered expensive, especially for first time home buyers. The acquisition cost, in terms of the down payments needed for the purchase and the servicing of the mortgage debt, were important factors in terms of access. Hence, the requirement for affordable housing as set by Dockside Green might not accurately have reflected the additional costs associated with the acquisition of a house, despite being subsidized. This strategy targeted home buyers, but it excluded typically less wealthy renters. This created the “islands of green privilege” detailed in the literature review (section 2.4.1) as the outcome of these neoliberal policies. It became a form of exclusion for the renters who did not have the purchasing power to buy an apartment. A look at the age of buyers at Dockside Green- Synergy and Balance shows that the majority of the purchasers were in the age group 50-59 (See Figure 9). This age group would have a higher purchasing power than younger age groups.
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**Figure 9:** Dockside Green purchaser ages
Source: Dockside Green (2008)

Evidently Dockside Green did not provide the affordable housing promised in the MDA within the first phases of development, due to the flexible approach of the City of Victoria in enforcing the provision of affordable housing. It can be said that the mayor at the time, Mayor Lowe, could foresee the problems that were associated with the implementation of affordable housing in the initial MDA (2005), for he viewed Dockside
Green as not being affordable (Clarke, April 12, 2006). Mayor Lowe expressed reservations about the affordable units that would be provided at Dockside Green and said council clearly "screwed up" when it approved the Master Development Agreement for Dockside Green. Lowe said he was initially concerned that the contract with the developers might have "watered down" the requirements for affordable housing compared to what Dockside Green had initially proposed (Curtis, 2006).

In questioning the affordability of housing at Dockside Green, Mayor Lowe was of the view that the developers were not committed to integrating all levels of income (Curtis, 2006). However, the developer insisted that it was inclusive of all, even though potential first-time home buyers fitting the criteria for the housing might be restricted, as well as excluded from purchasing an affordable unit. D'Antoni (2006), a young working individual interested in purchasing a suite and also one of the first individuals to pre-register to purchase stated the following:

I think the project is well thought out except for one aspect - price. The Dockside Green project is priced considerably out of step with Victoria and Vic West and is also considerably out of step with the local labour market. I have a good job, no student loans, no credit card debt, no car loans -- and I cannot afford even the most meagre of units in the Dockside developments. If I cannot buy a unit at Dockside, it makes me wonder who can. Individuals with low incomes qualify for subsidized housing at Dockside. However, middle-income earners and first-time home buyers have been priced out of the development. Effectively the only people who will be able to live in the Dockside development will be individuals with low incomes or exceedingly high incomes. Among the younger working community in Victoria, the Dockside development has earned the nickname "Dockside Scam."

Dockside Green provided subsidies for first time home buyers with the first phase, however, D'Antoni (2006) stated that:

First-time home buyers in Victoria have been particularly hard hit by the recent developments in the real estate market. I know a number of young people who have been effectively priced out of the housing market, and it only gets worse every year.

As part of its housing affordability strategy, the developer and the CHRC met and signed a memorandum of understanding (Dockside Green, 2010). This required that the developer undertake all construction costs and risks, would develop the affordable housing and would sell the building to the CHRC upon completion. In addition, there would be funding from the City of Victoria, the Regional Housing Trust Fund and
governmental agencies. While significant time and money was spent by CHRC, the developer was not able to secure all the necessary funding and could not rationalize the cost and risk of development. It was envisioned that the developer’s financial contribution to this component would result in the discharge of its remaining affordable housing obligation as set out in the MDA. However, this never materialized, and in order to proceed with the provision of the affordable housing component, the developer sought out a not-for-profit partner to provide affordable housing.

A public consultation process was conducted for the rezoning of the Dockside Green site and the provision of affordable housing in the next phase. The proposed site showed two parcels of land in relation to the rest of the area (see Figure 10). The provision of affordable housing did not have to meet LEED certification standards and there were less stringent requirements as compared to market housing in providing for affordable housing.

![Diagram of the Dockside Green site](image)

**Figure 10:** Madrona: proposed affordable housing
Source: Dockside Green 2015

Though the site received majority support for the provision of affordable housing, one participant in the consultation voiced the concern that the provision of affordable housing was an afterthought exercise which would impact the green ethos of the existing residents. Sceptical about the way the decision had been made, this respondent said:

.. Let’s jam two buildings into this tiny area where we can barely fit a laneway, let alone anything else. Don’t worry about liveability, residential access, or emergency vehicle issues, and forget about parking. Let’s call it “affordable housing” and get some consultants
involved to get the monkey off our back. Let’s avoid proper LEED certification because it’s a pain. Lastly, let’s increase the density to a point where we might turn a profit – who cares if it doesn’t fit with what is there. Anyhow, we did a big planning process for the rest of the development, so let’s pretend this was part of it and see if we can [get] this by the new Mayor and councillor. (Community member feedback, 2015).

However, even though the speaker mentioned that the development was profit motivated, in order to complete the development of the affordable housing in the preceding stage, the local not-for-profit housing agency, the Catalyst Community Development Society, was selected as the partner for the construction of affordable housing. In 2017 the Madrona affordable housing project was completed (see Figure 16). The total cost of the project was $9.5 mil. Madrona is regarded as an important part of delivering social sustainability and is an inclusive neighbourhood at Dockside Green. Shearing explained how committed Dockside Green was to the provision of affordable housing:

It had been a while, you know, since any development on Dockside ... six or seven years. It had been a while and we had an affordable housing obligation on the site that was going to stay in, no matter what we did. And it was an important element to the city and it was a really important element to [the] board. And I suggested that we, that that be the first development that we do: One, to address the obligation that we had to deliver those units, and the other is to show that we were committed, that we remained committed to delivering on our obligations in our plans and moving forward (Interview, 2017).

There were two buildings with a total of 49 units, which included studio apartments and four-bedroom townhouses. Affordability requirements and income limits were applied for the tenants (Brown, 2018). Rental rates for the units were to be based on a maximum of 30% of the targeted household income, ranging between $25,000 and $60,000. In addition, the housing agreement ensured that it would be rental tenure for perpetuity (Lui, 2017). This was also in line with the Fainstein idea (2010), in that affordable housing should remain in perpetuity. By having this mechanism in place, the affordable housing was preserved, and not being turned into market housing.
However, this might result in tension in achieving social equity. In the provision of basic affordable housing, certain factors are considered. Housing is intended to provide shelter, but cost, location and size and meeting the affordability requirement are all matters that affect the viability of the development. Incorporating green features into affordable housing also adds to the cost of construction. Therefore, the economic feasibility for the development is critical in maintaining and preserving the affordability requirement. However, Curran explained that it is possible to have affordable green housing:


..... affordable or green is not that much more expensive than conventional, if you can amortize it for a longer period of time. So say,......it’s a lower operating cost, so it’s a wash as long as they don’t limit their payback to seven years. As long as they can have twenty-year payback period ... There is no reason, in my view, for affordable housing organizations not to be green as long as they can convince their funders and their bankers for them to have a longer amortization period (Interview, 2017).

It should be noted that although the Dockside Green site was required to meet LEED-ND requirements, the inclusion of affordable housing was an option within the LEED-ND points system. Dockside Green was therefore able to achieve the highest qualification without necessarily providing for social housing. As an optional credit in the
LEED-ND system, affordable housing was not an element of sustainable development valued on an even footing with environmental components.

Based on the research that was conducted by Szibbo (2016), only 40% of the LEED-ND certified projects from 2009-2014 had affordable housing. In addition, Szibbo (2016) stated that 26% of the LEED-ND projects did not pursue credits for diverse housing types. According to Szibbo (2016) and Garde (2009), the LEED rating system did a poor job of encouraging developers to provide affordable housing.

Having completed the market and non-market rental housing and market affordable ownership, Dockside Green is considered to have fulfilled its affordable housing commitments, although the project is not completely built out. The developer is thus not required to provide additional affordable housing in the future neighbourhood redevelopment phases. Therefore, the affordable housing consists of the 49 Madrona units and the 26 affordable market units (from Phase 1 and 2). Of the current total of 226 residential units, this means that 28% of the housing units meet some affordability threshold. With the total buildout of the site of 1100 residential units, this would make the proportion of affordable units approximately 7%. However, it can be questioned whether this approach is adequate in addressing an inclusive and just community, as in the Dockside Green development affordable housing only forms a very small proportion of the overall units.

Clearly the neoliberal approach and market mechanisms limit the provision of social housing. Dockside Green was viewed as part of the solution in addressing some of the problems experienced in the city, such as the provision of affordable housing. Without the government intervening, the market was inept at solving the housing problem. The City of Victoria made it a requirement for the developer to provide for affordable housing. This seemed problematic as this requirement was partially met by the developer. When the City of Victoria assumed the role of the enabling government, it supported the provision of affordable housing by a private developer, and hoped to contribute to the general public good.

Even though Dockside Green emphasized that affordable housing was a priority, it appears that this might not have been the case, as environmental amenities were prioritised in the initial phases of the development. Curran stated that developers should
not be expected to assume the load for affordable housing, but she acknowledged it is a missing component in sustainable developments, noting that: "We do green quite well, but we don't do the social aspect of sustainability well" (Curtis, May 23, 2006).

5.2.3. Public amenities

An equitable community is one with no exclusionary tendencies, hindering individuals from fully participating in the community. The creation of public spaces that are inclusive is critical in the development of sustainable neighbourhoods. In addition, provision and creation of public spaces promotes social cohesion and equity in neighbourhoods. Within the broader context, socio-economic status often dictates access to green infrastructure. Within the neighbourhood context, the provision of amenities and public spaces contributes not only to environmental but also to social benefits. This improves the lives of members of the community and contributes to the inclusiveness of the neighbourhood. It also adds to the attractiveness of the place, and hence its competitive advantage.

Dockside Green’s social sustainability statement envisions “a neighbourhood where citizens can gather” (Dockside Green, 2016). In analyzing the public realm of Dockside Green, it is important to consider that 75% of the site is still undeveloped (see Figure 12). With that in mind, this study only analyzed the quality of public spaces in the completed part of the development. The MDA (2005) stipulated the provision of public amenities whereby some were to be met in the first phase of the development. However, with the change of timing in the construction of Dockside Green due to changing market conditions, the timing that was set out on the MDA schedule had to change, and consequently the sequencing of the provision of amenities (Dockside Green, 2011).

This has placed a financial burden on the developers as the site is not yet fully developed and therefore does not have the full benefit of a completed neighbourhood. Although some amenities have been provided, such as the sewage treatment system and the improvement of public infrastructure, some planned public spaces have not been realized on the site. These include the play area, large plaza and a park. Although promises have been made within the 2014 Neighbourhood Vision to provide for more
public space, at the time of writing the current residents are deprived of access to this space.
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**Figure 12: Dockside Green Site**
Credit: Photo by author, 2019

The Fainstein (2010) Just City Framework states that public spaces should be widely accessible and varied. In linking this with the Dockside Green case study, it is clear that there is a deficiency of varied public spaces at Dockside Green, and this signifies the level of inclusiveness of the site. The lack of adequate community spaces has led to the coffee shop, Café Fantastico being a social space in Dockside Green. This also includes the exterior of the café, which is accessible to everyone (see Figure 18). In a neighbourhood with no parks or other suitable gathering spaces, the coffee shop has become the space for social interactions among people with diverse backgrounds and of varying ages.

The café has become a vital part of the neighbourhood for people to gather and meet, and this enhances the social cohesion of the neighbourhood. In addition, as the café is adjacent to the Galloping Goose cycle track, it has also become a place for cyclists to congregate. The site also echoes Fainstein (2010), who said that boundaries between zones should be porous. This allows for easy movement into the
neighbourhood and there are no visible transitions that are ambiguous. Thus, the site also contributes to diversity and limits segregation.

The café offers a hub, not only for the different people from the neighbourhood of Dockside Green, but also passers-by and people from neighbouring areas. Therefore, it is more than a neighbourhood café. Nonetheless, with the deficiency of planned community/public spaces where residents can gather, it can be said that the physical environment is of low quality as there are limited and restricted spaces for social activities and the promotion of social cohesion (Gehl, 2016). Public spaces play a critical role in forging social interactions that foster a sense of belonging in the community. However, the café as a dimension of a public space as highlighted in Table 4, is not freely accessible and requires a fee for services. Thus, access is restricted and not wholly inclusive of all populations. Therefore, the café is considered as a semi-public space.

In adding to the quality of the public spaces at Dockside Green, narrow pathways between buildings encourage interaction between residents and also with outsiders. These spaces can provide opportunities for residents to meet through chance encounters. It brings the residents into close proximity to each other and thus can encourage social ties, although they might seem like forced interactions. However, during my field observation, the narrow pathways were very close to the residents’ private spaces, thus there was a feeling of intrusion by non-residents of the site. However, the high density also contributes to social mixing in the urban fabric that is essential in the contribution of social cohesion.
The shortfall of public spaces has led to the residents creating their own public spaces. Maura Chestnutt from Catalyst development, who manages the Madrona site, commented as follows regarding the lack of public space:

I had to get a little creative. We have no amenity room or anything. We did pumpkin carving at the carport last weekend, so just rented some tables and brought them in. And in the summer we did a barbeque by
blocking off the mews in front of the... So blocking off the road in front of the studio units and we set that up for a barbeque. And then a few of our tenants work at Ollie Quinn optical, and they have an internal mission to have community space available. So we use their community room when we need to have a meeting inside. So that’s amazing because it’s very difficult to have meetings as a group if there is nowhere to meet, especially when it’s raining and it’s cold (Interview, 2018).

Dockside Green also implemented greening strategies that included rooftop gardens on some of the buildings. However, these rooftops gardens are not accessible to the rest of community. Only the residents in the buildings have access, which is restrictive. As highlighted in the literature review in Section 2.4.2, Agyeman (2013) referred to this as an “equity deficit” due to spaces not being accessible to everyone. Although this can be a criticism of the rooftop gardens, they also create opportunities for urban agriculture and can be used as recreational and gathering spaces for residents within that building to meet and get to know their neighbours. The rooftop gardens also promote an increase in social bonds, contribute to an increase in wellbeing, and enhance the attractiveness of the area. However, these spaces tend to contribute to inequity and undermine social inclusiveness and cohesion.

The sustainability centre was originally planned in the MDA (2005) and $400,000 was contributed by Dockside Green towards its creation. It is intended to be used by environmental NGOs and non-profits coming together to share space, to share vision, and to manage the space. However, the funds allotted seem to be inadequate. Shearing described the sustainability centre as follows:

When it was originally proposed it had a square footage, square foot size about 20 000 square feet. And then if it was over 40 000 square feet. Then that space was free space, didn’t get counted in the FSR. But a 20 000 square foot space is like a size of a grocery store. So you think of sustainability centre that was loosely defined, you know, as a bunch of environmental NGOs, non-profits coming together to share space, to share vision, to manage the space and to kind of co-exist, it’s a huge amount of space. And just in the development cost, the loan, you know, a building that size, stripped down, maybe it’s 6-7 million dollars. So those organizations would have to do a capital funding call for their parcel... we just couldn’t see it being realized... but there were a few people within Vic West who were again very emotionally attached to that idea and they weren’t going to let it go (Interview, 2017).

The vision for the sustainability centre followed some of the Northern European examples such as Hammarby Sjostadt, whereby the sustainability centres house or act as exhibition centres for sustainability to highlight the development of the
neighbourhood. But in the case of Dockside Green, there was no definition of what the sustainability centre would do (Marler, 2017). In addition, with the budget of $400,000 that has been set aside for the centre, it was not financially feasible. According to the Dockside Green report (2008), the developer spent approximately $100,000 in exploring how to create a sustainability centre. It is also documented that in 2008 there were various NGOs that were interested in the development of the sustainability centre and that presentations were made which would lead to the planning and construction of the sustainability centre. However, the construction of the sustainability centre was never realized. With this consideration, there is a need to re-envision the sustainability centre by making the site economically viable. Shearing explained:

...I was already carrying out—and, you know, we have that contribution. And that's a pretty good start for a group to be able to begin look at funding something. But I didn't want to take on any more, just trying to make the development economically viable. So, so the city and VicWest neighbourhood and ourselves will have to figure it out at the time of the development of the site. But yes, it will be, I mean the vision for it was pretty thin anyways, so will have to be re-visioned (Interview, 2017).

5.2.4. Transportation strategies

Transportation options play a critical role in influencing exclusion and spatial injustice. In order to promote social equity, public infrastructure should be inclusive and provide accessible transportation to meet all the needs of the residents. Hence, social equity in the context of accessibility focuses on the diverse options that enable the ease and convenience of getting to a desired destination. Lack of accessibility to transport is a barrier to opportunity and one which can intensify social exclusion on the urban landscape. This also means that every resident should have the means and the ability to access key economic and social activities. The access to opportunities necessitated by daily urban mobility is central to being able to take part in an urban landscape. Transport equity ensures that there is an equitable provision of access for all groups, specifically the deprived and most vulnerable members of the community (Tumlin, 2012).

Although sustainable transport solutions provide a range of strategies to counter urban disintegration, they necessitate spatial planning that moves past a stringent mobility concern to emphasize equitable access (Brown-Luthango et al., 2017). Provision of good quality pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, vehicle free zones,
availability and frequency of public transportation affect the accessibility of the
neighbourhood, thereby contributing to a more socially sustainable neighbourhood.

Transport is an investment tool that cities use to help achieve larger goals, such
as inclusiveness. A vital component of the sustainability agenda is awareness of justice
in transportation through facilitating and supporting equity and accessibility (Schiller &
Kenworthy, 2018). The ideal city focuses on areas of efficiency which have a variety of
environmentally sound transportation choices and make walking and biking good
alternatives. The location of Dockside Green is ideal in promoting social equity and
provides equitable opportunities for access to services and opportunities because it is
located close to the downtown, public transportation and the popular biking trail, the
Galloping Goose Trail.

Through the implementation of the transport management strategies listed in
schedule F of the MDA (2005), Dockside Green has promoted reduction in the
dependence on car use. Since 2008, the Modo Car Share Co-op has had one vehicle at
Dockside Green adjacent to the Balance building, the first such car-share parking in
Victoria (see Figure 14). In addition, in the Spring of 2013, electric car charging stations
were installed (Dockside Green, 2013). The car share is used as alternative
transportation alongside public transit, cycling and walking. The aim of this strategy was
to reduce vehicle ownership and pollution, thereby contributing to sustainable living. As
outlined in the MDA (2005), the developer provided free membership of the co-op. In
addition, at the Madrona affordable housing project, bikes were provided for the
Madrona residents. According to Dockside Green (2011), it provided underground
storage for bicycles. In Synergy, 99 bicycle lockers were provided, while in Balance, 171
bicycle lockers were provided.

Transport policies are considered equitable if they cater for economically and
socially disadvantaged groups (Tumlin, 2012). Accordingly, transport equity aims at
reducing mobility-based social exclusion. Public transportation is also seen as a means
of reducing mobility-based exclusion. In this regard, the developer set out to coordinate
with BC Transit in order to add additional bus routes at Dockside and also add a mini-
transit bus at Dockside Green, as set out in the MDA (2005). However, the developer’s
negotiation with BC Transit has not been successful as there has not been any addition
to the existing line or provision of alternative transportation.
a) Car-share at Dockside Green

b) Narrow pathways between buildings at Dockside Green

c) Bicycle stands

d) Car-parking facilities for visitors

e) Parking Facilities for Madrona

e) Traffic calming measures- pedestrian and cyclist friendly

Figure 14: Transportation related infrastructure at Dockside Green
Note: Photos by author, 2019
Dockside Green also adopted strategies to reduce car usage through parking restrictions, such as the amount and the availability of parking and the creation of car free streets. Putting these measures in place has led to relatively low car ownership. At Madrona, there are only six parking spots (Chestnutt, interview, 2018). Fainstein (2010) highlighted that the promotion of equity should include low cost public transit. In the Dockside Green context, new residents receive three years of subsidized transit passes. By providing all these transport options, especially to low income families, inclusivity is ensured for all residents. Deprived of adequate transport, people are at risk of exclusion from economic and social activities such as employment, services, schooling and social and familial interactions.

Chestnutt stated that with more people being increasingly environmentally conscious, more households own bicycles. Chestnutt also stated that one of the reasons for moving to Madrona was that:

... it’s pretty much a car free building. So, I find that interesting as well. One tenant in particular said he had made a decision growing up in Mexico City that he never wanted to own a car and he said he made that decision when he was ten. And that was major reason why he wanted to move to Madrona, was that he would be living with other people who didn’t own cars as well. And then it’s walkable to everything in the city .... (Interview, 2017).

The Transportation Management Plan at Dockside Green is essential for identifying transport sustainability needs for the neighbourhoods. However, Chestnutt also explained that they did not anticipate the degree to which residents owned their own bicycles.

....... It was a great idea probably 15 years ago and quite revolutionary. In practice, it has not been a great experience. So, we purchased 49 bikes but now a lot of the tenants moving into the building have their own, better bikes. So, we have no parking for their bikes. We didn’t account for families having four or five bikes. Some people have three bikes of their own, so they might have an off-road and then a city bike and yeah... So, what would have been better—but I don’t think they realized it was on the horizon when the agreement was made—would have had a bike share. Like a Mobi would have been great. So right now, we just have to store some bikes off-site (Interview, 2017).

With respect to Figure 2 showing the 3-Legged stool of sustainable transportation by Schiller and Kenworthy (2018), Dockside Green has made an effort to encourage a pedestrian friendly network, providing cycling facilities, and has tried to make public
transportation more affordable. Dockside Green has also addressed the physical factors of social sustainability i.e. accessibility, and the walkability aspects of the neighbourhood which are detailed by Dempsey et al. (2010) in Section 2.3.1 of the literature review. Therefore, to a greater degree Dockside Green has provided equitable access to services, facilities and opportunities as a result of transport options that are efficient, affordable, accessible and safe.

5.3. Chapter summary

Dockside Green’s sustainability is a complex concept with multiple dimensions. This chapter examined Dockside and how social sustainability was realized. It also analyzed the targeted actions that were implemented at Dockside Green. Chapter 2 highlights the process of neoliberal policies adopted at Dockside Green, the challenges that were associated with the implementation of the MDA (2005) and also what prompted the amendment of the MDA in 2016. In summary, the project failed to meet its expectations and the commitments that were set out in the MDA (2005).

The aim of this chapter was to critically examine the implementation of social sustainability principles in the design of the neighbourhood. It analyzes the current amenities that are provided on-site, as well as the affordable housing and the alternative transportation options. By analyzing the physical features of the built environment, it highlights the degree to which social sustainability outcomes are achieved. The provision of local amenities and public areas, the organization of activities by the residents and socialising in the outdoor spaces has restricted social interaction at Dockside Green. Regarding the housing structure at Dockside Green, the age profile of the residents shows a larger representation of older residents, although there is a mix of housing types and tenure to encourage mingling of social groups. Therefore, Dockside Green has not been successful in attracting a range of residents. Dockside Green was also not able to provide a social mix, and inclusion and diversity of social groups. It is a neighbourhood that has won several awards based on sustainability, mostly environmentally related, but it is not a good example of social sustainability.

Also, in critically analyzing the social sustainability aspect, it is clear that Dockside Green did not comply with all of the MDA requirements.
Chapter 6. Conclusion

The aim of the research was to answer the following:

1. How do the social sustainability strategies and results apparent at Dockside Green reflect a negotiation and balance between social justice and neoliberal justification for green neighbourhoods?

2. How does Dockside Green currently define, envision and interpret social dimensions of sustainability?

In order to answer these questions, the paper recognizes that social sustainability is a very broad term and that Fainstein’s just city framework provides the foundation for how to analyse social justice around Dockside Green. However, the study acknowledges the shortcomings of the definition of social sustainability in that some aspects of social sustainability were not included.

It is also important to highlight that neoliberalism is not a monolithic phenomenon, thus the occurrences at Dockside Green might differ from other sites. The study largely considered equity and inclusion based on economic justice and not necessarily based on (for example) age, ethnicity or sexual orientation. Rather, the study focused on the scope that was considered by the MDA (2005) and the developer. The aim of the study was to analyze and evaluate how agreed upon social components on paper were applied practically at the neighbourhood scale. Consequently, I focused on the different urban dimensions of neighbourhood planning and design, which included transportation, housing, public spaces and other public amenities, and considered how these are used in addressing social equity at neighbourhood level. This is essential in evaluating the factors that shape how master-planned sustainable neighbourhoods implement social sustainability, and the role of local government in the process.

Prior to redevelopment, Dockside Green was owned by the City of Victoria, but redevelopment did not commence before the land was acquired by a private developer. From the onset of the project, the city of Victoria required a triple bottom line approach in transforming the former brownfields through a site remediation process into a sustainable community. Due to its innovation and commitment to meeting the LEED-ND platinum certification, the developer received unanimous support from both the city council and community. With the purchase of the site and in order to begin
redevelopment, the developer signed the MDA (2005), a unique site-specific legal
document that dictated particular and ambitious environmental and social features and
characteristics for the 15-acre mixed-use development. Looking closely at the MDA, the
features specified tended toward project components that could be quantified and thus,
toward environmental advances in green building and neighbourhood design. The ability
of the MDA (2005) to address social equity was limited, however. This was attributed to
the lack of clarity around specific actions that could be taken that would have an impact
on social justice outcomes in this neighbourhood, something that remains open to
debate.

The case study uses the green governmentality lens to highlight how the City of
Victoria applied authority and control over environmental management in relation to
urban development. It also highlights the techniques for regulation that were applied to
certain knowledge systems, in this instance sustainable development focusing on the
triple bottom line approach. Dockside Green’s vision was to “provide opportunities for
inclusion and connectedness among the community’s neighbours” and also the
provisions outlined in the original MDA (2005). As the aim of the study was to highlight
the consequences of urban neoliberal governance on social sustainability, the research
looked at the urban social dimensions that were listed in the MDA (2005) to see how
they were translated into reality. On the ground, this was not as successful as
envisioned. With the TBL approach, in the Dockside Green project, sustainability was
mostly defined as environmental sustainability through a weak sustainability lens. As
social sustainability also lacks a concrete definition, its concept has a certain fluidity to it
that makes it difficult to gauge the extent of social sustainability. However, the MDA
(2005) provided specific outcomes and commitments that the developer was required to
meet. Some of the environmental features included in the site do have social
sustainability benefits, such as the greenway and active transportation strategies, which
promote walkability, active and inexpensive transportation modes at the same time as
they work to lower CO₂ emissions (Dempsey et al., 2011).

Dockside Green demonstrates how the City of Victoria developed a mechanism
to encourage and support innovative neighbourhood-scale planning and design. In
contrast, the approach of Peck and Tickell (2002) provided an opportunity to analyze the
neoliberal process in urban development. The literature review documented challenges
that are associated with neoliberal planning and how it undermines social sustainability.
Therefore, Dockside Green became a location for neoliberal policy experimentation. It highlights decentralization and privatization of powers to effect sustainability changes, noting the enabling role of the state in providing a supportive role in making way for market-based solutions and, in so doing, supporting capitalist accumulation. However, this strategy also sees a reduction in government’s provision of public resources, a role that is taken on by the private sector. Consequently, it also illustrates the connection between neoliberalism and the conflict between the competing urban development imperatives of the City, promoting community goals on one hand, and the private developer promoting an individual benefits of life in a green neighbourhood on the other hand. In the case of Dockside Green the environmental sustainability components such as the green infrastructure were commodified as these increase the livability as well as the competitiveness of the site. This led to social sustainability being reduced to low-priority status in the development process in Dockside Green.

Considering the degree of social equity attained through the development of Dockside Green to date, the neighbourhood provides a small number of affordable housing units along with a high local environmental quality and set of amenities, which do have social sustainability benefits as well. The research findings highlight that the urban design and the physical infrastructure affect social sustainability. However, the analysis of the public spaces highlighted that there were limited public places for gathering on site, which may have consequences for social cohesion and social interactions on site. In many instances, the site was referred to as being exclusive/affluent spaces. The trends illustrated in this case study of Dockside Green suggest the consideration of social factors, including affordable housing, public spaces and equitable transportation options within sustainable neighbourhoods. But when these factors were seen to conflict with profit demands, the demand for a positive financial balance on the site were seen to take precedent. For green neighbourhoods to be justly sustainable, inclusion and equity should be considered as non-negotiable, a position that often conflicts with a neoliberal agenda.

The analysis also revealed some compelling counter-trends to this dominant story. The study also highlights the social justice in respect of the role of Dockside Green in considering past inequities. Although there was no provision to acknowledge the First Nations as the previous inhabitants on the land in the MDA, the developer was able to address this without the City of Victoria prompting it to do so. In addition, the
implementation of the transportation management plan on the site promoted equity in that a wide range of options for sustainable transportation were offered. These included provisions of bicycles, the availability of public transit and a co-op car share.

The challenges that were associated with the implementation of the MDA (2005) objectives are exposed in the case study. The MDA (2005) was used to compel the developer to meet the sustainability objectives. The specifications within the MDA drew strongly from the LEED-ND certification framework components, adding to the justification for each of the sustainability objectives specified. In so doing, the City also used the MDA as a mechanism to hold the developer accountable in meeting the obligations and commitments outlined in the agreement. However, although mechanisms existed to hold the developer responsible for these provisions within the development, this study shows that the City was ultimately not willing to enforce these provisions against the developer when the developer’s profitability suffered to bring Windmill to the point of bankruptcy. The MDA (2005) was presented to the public as a sort of guarantee about the sustainability offerings of this new community never intended to be altered or modified. Due to the economic downturn in 2008, the financial viability of the development was reduced, which in turn negatively affected the ability of the developer to meet the social sustainability obligations – in fact, all building activities halted for the better part of a decade. The unanticipated market conditions and the evolution in the understanding of what sustainable development entailed, prompted the City and the developer to redraft the MDA in 2016.

The redrafting of the MDA was part of a suite of activities undertaken by the City and Vancity, the financial institution which took over as sole developer following Windmill’s removal from development activities, to make the DSG project more appealing for purchase and build-out. As a result, there have been some changes and a revised public amenity package which include the following: a public dog park; provision of 6 mobility hubs on the site; purchase of 6 car shares, waterfront mews and the Dockside Commons which replaces the plaza. In addition, Dockside Green received a LEED-ND v4 Plan Platinum Certification for the revised plan. As LEED ND Platinum certification was attained for both the initial development and for the Plan for the updated development of site, this provides some insights in how LEED certification can be utilised to promote social sustainability through smart locations and linkages and neighbourhood pattern and design. These changes also highlight a new expression of
the site and a change in the priorities to increase the public spaces and amenities at Dockside Green. It will be interesting to see the outcomes of the revised plan once the project is built out.

General lessons can be drawn from the case study in that balancing public and private interests in the understanding and implementation of social equity appears to pose a major challenge, and therefore social sustainability outcomes are not fully achieved. This study shows how the City of Victoria played a leadership role in supporting innovations in sustainable development through its TBL approach and the specifications of the MDA negotiated with the developer. The instrumental role of the City in this case is consistent with other research that has shown local governments to be crucial to the attainment of sustainable development outcomes when they advocate for, enable, and implement new urbanist style neighbourhood planning and landscape architecture (compact, mixed use and mixed income settlements) (Trudeau, 2013). Where the City’s leadership fell short in the case of DSG was in the willingness to enforce its agreement when economic conditions changed, the profitability of the enterprise was threatened, and sustainability stipulations were no longer being met. Therefore, this study highlights that social justice is at risk of being sidelined and subjugated in neighbourhood planning to cater for profitability, economic growth and the competitiveness agenda. This study provides an understanding of the processes involved in the implementation of social sustainability in green neighbourhoods and the role of urban neoliberal governance and planning.

While this study has outlined and addressed social sustainability, a number of gaps in information that were found in the research and this opens the potential for future studies. Therefore, recommendations for future studies include conducting research to determine the motivation for cities or developers to adopt LEED-ND in the pursuit of a sustainable neighbourhoods as well as the role of LEED-ND in neighbourhood developments. Further research is also required to understand the process of meaningful engagement and partnerships with the First Nations in developing sustainable communities. Finally, further research in an understanding the mechanisms that motivate and encourage affordable housing for both non-profit and for-profit developers. These insights might assist in building our understanding of how social sustainability strategies can be better attained.
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Appendix: Codes used for Analysis

- Planning phase
  - History of site
  - Business Case
  - RFP Process
  - Contamination of site
- Vision
- Triple Bottom Line
- Key role players
- Federal government
- City of Victoria
- Public Interest
- Private interests
- Image, Branding and Place Marketing
- Development Amenity Schedule
- Public Amenities
  - Sustainability Centre
  - Wastewater treatment plant
  - Biomass gasification plant
- Distinctiveness characteristics
- Innovation
- Evolution of sustainability
- Neoliberal governance
- Collaborative planning
- Negotiative networks/Flexibility
- Diversity
- Inclusion
- Public consultation
- Market driven
- Competitiveness
- 2007/8 Market downturn
- Affordable housing
  - Catalyst
  - Criteria for allocation
  - Funding and Cost
- MDA
  - Complexity of MDA
  - LEED requirement
  - Challenges
  - Noise
  - Monitoring process